

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

BOOK

335

CLASS

W887c

VOLUME

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below. A
charge is made on all overdue
books.

U. of I. Library

MAY -8 1939 MAR 28 1948 JUN 14 1959

APR 27 1948

MAY 22 1949 MAY -4 1949

APR 25 1960

JUN -5 1939 MAY 20 1949

JUN 11 1969

DEC 28 1959

MAY 31 1941 MAR 10 1954

NOV 29 1954

MAR 17 1943

DEC 21 1955

MAY 19 1944

JUN -8 1945 JAN 19 1959

MAY -2 1955

MAY -9 1958

MAY 3 1948

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

IN

THEIR HISTORY AND THEORY

A SKETCH

BY

THEODORE D. WOOLSEY

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1894

COPYRIGHT BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.
1880.

TROTS DIRECTORY
PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING COMPANY
NEW YORK

335

11887c

3 Apr. 05 Nichols

PREFACE.

THE greater part of the work which is now offered to the public, first appeared a few months since, under the form of weekly articles, in the *New York Independent*. It is now republished with some additions, which are chiefly appendixes, giving the views of others on certain special points.

The object of the work will be sufficiently evident on slight examination. From very early times there has been felt, under several forms of civilization and religion, a dissatisfaction with the existing institutions of society, which has given birth to the desire of forming communities within the state and protected by it, yet separated from the rest of the people. Ideals, also, of reformed political societies have been given to the world, which grew out of this same dissatisfaction with the actual order of things. And in the most modern times these Utopias have passed over into plans for a new social system,

96

71892

which aims at gaining the control over all civilized states. We have attempted to sketch the leading features of these smaller communities and Utopias, and of modern socialism, founded on equality and political economy, in the hope of showing the similarities and differences of the schemes, devised for carrying on the work of society without private property.

The class of persons for whom we have written, are those who would relish neither extensive details touching the communities of the past, which have left no mark on society, nor a long exposition of the economical principles of modern socialism. Should this system gain such favor as seriously to threaten the present order of things, we earnestly hope that other essays, more elaborate and comprehensive than the present one, will be written for its confutation.

NEW HAVEN, December, 1879.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITION AND ESSENCE OF COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM.

	PAGE
I.	1-16
II.	16-23

CHAPTER II.

SMALLER COMMUNISTIC SOCIETIES WITHIN THE STATE.

I. Buddhist Monks—Essenes—Therapeutæ, . . .	24-33
II. The Christian Monastic System, . . .	33-41
III. Anabaptists of Münster, . . .	42-50
IV. The Shakers, . . .	50-60
V. Smaller Communities concluded, . . .	60-72
Appendix I. No 1. Change in the system of the Perfectionists, 73-75 ; No. 2. New matter from Mr. Hinds' American Communists, . . .	73-84

CHAPTER III.

COMMUNISTIC THEORIES AND UTOPIAS.

I. Plato—Sir Thomas More—Campanella, . . .	85-95
II. Theories, in France, of Mably and Morelly. The same reduced to Practice in Babœuf's Conspiracy, . . .	96-106

	PAGE
III. Theories of Communism—St. Simon and his Followers—Fourier,	106-115
IV. Certain Religious Socialists—Laroux, Cabet, Louis Blanc,	115-125

CHAPTER IV.

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

I. Origin, Organization, Rules,	126-136
II. International continued—Number of Members—Congresses of Geneva, Lausanne, Brussels, Basel,	136-146
III. International concluded—Schism in Switzerland—Its Members at Paris in 1871—Manifesto of the Council at London—Effects of Events at Paris,	146-159

CHAPTER V.

SOCIALISM IN GERMANY.

I. Leading Features of the Theory of Marx,	160-171
II. Lassalle and the German Workingmen's Union,	171-181
III. Socialism in Germany since Lassalle,	181-192
Appendix. Mr. Mill's Chapters on Socialism,	193-200

CHAPTER VI.

SCHAEFFLE'S "QUINTESSENCE OF SOCIALISM."

I.	201-214
II.	214-226

CHAPTER VII.

RECENT SOCIALISM IN ITS RELATIONS, ETC.

I. To the State and to Society,	227-238
II. To the Individual and to Religion,	238-249

	PAGE
III. To Religion (continued), to the Family and Marriage,	250-260
IV. Relations to Society concluded,	260-267
Appendix I. Extract from the Einfluss der Herr- schenden Ideen of Eötvös,	267-271
Appendix II. Extract from F. A. Lange's "Arbeit- erfrage," Ed. 3,	271-275

CHAPTER VIII.

I. Is the Overthrow of Society in its present Form by Socialism probable?	276-286
II. Future Prospects of Socialism,	287-299
Index,	301-309

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITION AND ESSENCE OF COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM.

I.

IN an essay like this it seems to be necessary to define the terms often used synonymously, which are employed to denote the subject of the essay itself. There are two such terms which are of constant occurrence, *communism* and *socialism*, the first of earlier origin than the other; besides which two others, of still more modern birth, *collectivism* and *mutualism*, have sprung up in France, and are less current, although the former of them is now often employed in books and public discussions.

Communism, in its ordinary signification, is a system or form of common life, in which the right of private or family property is abolished by law, mutual consent, or vow. To this community of goods *may* be added the disappearance of family life, and the substitution for it of a mode of life

in which, whether the family system is retained or not, the family is no longer the norm according to which the subdivisions of the community, if there are any, are regulated. But while the father's authority in the separate parts of the community is of little or no account, there are rulers of some sort, who must have a considerable degree of power, in order to prevent the system from falling to pieces.

A whole state or nation may be conceived of as being parcelled out into a number of communities, each of which would have its property and its rights of property over against the rest. Yet all the communities which have appeared in the world have, so far as I know, been established within states which are not themselves communistic in their institutions; so that the smaller bodies are protected by greater bodies which have no especial affinities with them, or may even be regarded by them with dislike. Whether a state broken up into communities could long exist may be doubted. So also the theoretic communities which political dreamers have imagined, are either small and simple, or, if complex, are affiliated, as monastic communities also, generally, are, under a law outside of, and above, their own.

2. *Socialism* was not known as a term synonymous, or nearly so, with communism until recent times. The first writers who can be discovered to have used it were Frenchmen.

By its derivation it ought to denote the system of those who would socialize states or subdivisions of states, or, in other words, would organize the people of a nation according to their idea of what society ought to be, or, in other words still, would reform society according to a social theory of their own. The theory might or might not correspond with the idea or the rule on which a communistic society is founded. Socialism is therefore a broader term than communism. It might embrace systems for a state, and systems for smaller communities which could not be adapted to a state; it might include community of goods, and other kinds of common participation; or might even discard them, as far as the derivation of the term is concerned. But in matter of fact, having been coined by those who had communistic principles, and in an age when it was desirable to avoid the terms *communist* and *communism*, as being somewhat odious, it denotes almost universally a theory or a system into which community of goods, or better, abolition nearly or quite complete of private property, enters as an essential part; and again a system which embraces an entire society or state, if not a cluster of contiguous states, or even the world. And it is, as thus used, no longer a system, if I may so speak, of disintegration, but one of consolidation, subjecting all the members of a state, willingly or unwillingly, to the control of the state as the head of

society ; making it in fact the sole proprietor for the most part within the national territory. But although the term thus differs from the term *communism*, we may be pardoned if, in following other writers' examples, we use the two as synonymous now and then, since they both cover part of the same ground.

3 and 4. The two other terms need only a word or two for their definition. *Collectivism*, which is now used by German as well as by French writers, denotes the condition of a community when its affairs, especially its industry, is managed in the collective way, instead of the method of separate, individual effort. It has, from its derivation, some advantages over the vague word *socialism*, which may include many varieties of associated or united life. *Mutualism* (in French, *mutuelisme*), scarcely used beyond its birth-place, is intended to express the social and political condition constructed on a system of mutual and reciprocal relations, implying equality as far as it can be carried out. The community of property is thus an inference from what must come to pass if such a conception should be realized, rather than involved in the word. It may be worth noticing that the word in itself at its origin had nothing communistic about it ; and that *mutuum*, *mutuor*, in Latin, connected with *muto*, change, exchange, have the sense of a *loan*, and *to borrow*. The Romans, in their laws, social

life, and politics, were as far from socialism in the modern sense as possible.

The natural division of the subject before us is to consider first those smaller communities which were earliest in the order of time, and came into being within and under the state;—not for the purpose of undermining general society, but to enable a select number of similarly disposed persons to lead a life, which they could not easily lead without some separation from their fellow-men. After these may follow those theories for the rectification of existing society, which were never carried out, and perhaps were never intended to be carried out; but which expressed their authors' views in regard to the best constitution of society within the state. These theories, as time advanced, began to be something more than Utopias; they became, in France, revolutionary; they were animated by the spirit of equality and fraternity; and in their successive forms they approached nearer to the shape of definite plans and methods, by which the whole of society was not only to be affected, but to be put on an entirely new basis. At the same time the condition of the working-class became a subject of prominent interest. These French theories, or some of them, had not left the original ideas from which they started, so that they might be put to proof on the small scale in single communities and by way of experiment, as well as on the large

scale in the state. Such were Fourier's, Cabet's, and Louis Blanc's systems, although they aimed at the universal control of societies. We shall term these, all of them, communistic systems. But, by the help of the later French communists, a new system, or set of systems, arose, which could not be well applied on the small scale within the state, but aimed at controlling the state itself; and not the state only, but even a set of contiguous states, if not the world. The leading characteristic of this system is, that it is built chiefly on political economy, as understood by the advocates of the system; while moral notions, such as equality of rights and fraternity, are assumed and involved in the plans for carrying it out. The main force of the theory lies in abolishing private property, and giving the control of all industry to the state. It does not require a common life, but carries what had been before contemplated—the doctrine of common property—into all details. As reconstructing society in this way, it is properly called *socialism*, whether it appears in the shape of not entirely breaking with present society, like the half-way scheme of Lassalle, or in getting complete control of society, on the scheme of the ablest of those who would overturn society, like the accomplished, determined veteran, Karl Marx. This system, in the construction of which Germans have been most active, and which seems likely to

throw all others into the shade, which threatens to control the working-classes everywhere, and "with fear of change perplexes monarchs," we shall call *socialism*, without absolutely confining ourselves to this term, inasmuch as under it the great community—the state—now becomes the only subject of property.

It will thus be seen that *communism* does not really give up the notion of property either within the state, or over against all persons and communities which are outside of its pale: it also expressly admits the rightful existence of private property by receiving from private individuals, and that, in the way of free gift, what before was their own; by maintaining suits to defend such property, when once received; by transactions of bargain and sale with persons beyond their borders, and, in some cases, by returning such property to its former owner when he leaves a community. *Socialism*, on the other hand, while it may admit the state's right of property over against another state, does away with all ownership, on the part of members of the state, of things that do not perish in the using, or of their own labor in creating material products. Its first and last policy is to prevent the acquisition or exclusive use of capital, by any person or association under the control of the state, with the exception, perhaps, of articles of luxury or enjoyment procured by the savings of wages.

No savings can give rise to what is properly called capital, or means of production in private hands.

Communities have been established on various principles. The individuals that compose them enter voluntarily into association with others; and the societies themselves determine, within certain limits, which are subject to the control of public law, what their rules and the relations of members shall be. Thus the question of the entire surrender of property to the community by the entering member would naturally be a cardinal one, yet, state law might restrain him from so acting. The various questions relating to marriage and celibacy, to the employments of the grown-up members, to the forms of social union, to religious worship, if they have any, to the government of the society and the management of its property, are all laid down by general agreement at first, and may be altered unless the constitutions forbid. The reasons for entering such communities are various. Some of them, being strictly religious and confining membership to one or other of the sexes, would be destroyed in their essence, and probably their property be escheated, by departing from this idea. Others may be founded on religious grounds or for social reasons, may establish or abolish celibacy, and extinguish or tolerate existing family relations. The control, again, of the officers over the members may be strict or loose.

...means of fr
unless they should be judged to contain some
lawful element. Thus Cabet put his own plan to
the proof in the United States. Fourier's pha-
lansteries might be established as experiments to
teach the state what attitude it ought to take in
regard to them, and something like them has been
attempted outside of France. Ateliers, after the
plan of Louis Blanc's organization of labor, were
actually tried by one of the French governments.
These schemes were intended for the reform of
society, and it might be said that a failure in a
single case, when society was all on the other side,
was no real proof that in other circumstances such
plans might not be successful.

There may also be men who oppose property
and communism at once; who are called commu-
nists with no good will of their own. Such was
Pierre Joseph Proudhon, whose well-known motto,
borrowed from Brissot de Warville, was, "*La pro-
priété c'est le vol*," an expression of principle, by
the way, which Brissot gave up before he was
guillotined. Proudhon's own opinions are known
from passages in his first memoir on property:
we give them in English in Mr. Benjamin R.
Tucker's translation, p. 259:

"I ought not to conceal the fact that property

...at is, at ...
...constitution for society and for the state
at once. It is therefore, when viewed on one
side, far more imperious and widesweeping than
communism. It is so opposed to the present
order of society that it must transform and over-
turn, either by the peaceable consent of the mass
of men in a state, and by thus getting possession
of a state's principal resources (which is entirely
incredible), or by revolutionizing society. On the
other hand, having got such control, it scarcely has
had in view, as yet, so great a change and separa-
tion from the society of the present, in some re-
spects, as some of the communities, which are pro-
tected by states, have introduced on the small scale.
Give it the control over capital, and it may leave
marriage, in a measure education, and the choice
of religion, free to the people which it has re-
organized.

Such would *pure socialism* be; but the theory
may be so modified, either to secure an improve-
ment on society as it is, or to provide for an
easier transition to an unmixed socialism of the
future, that it will be important to take into view
such departures in theory from the strict idea of
the system, if any such there be.

The later French systems of social change, as

and communism have been considered always the only possible forms of society. This deplorable error has been the life of property. The disadvantages of communism are so obvious that its critics have never needed to employ much eloquence to thoroughly disgust men with it. The irreparability of the injustice which it causes, the violence which it does to attractions and repulsions, the yoke of iron which it fastens on the will, the moral torture to which it subjects the conscience, the debilitating effect which it has upon society, and, to sum it all up, the pious and stupid uniformity which it enforces upon the free, active, reasoning, unsubmissive personality of man, have shocked common sense and condemned communism by an irreversible decree."

And in another place he indulges himself in a similar strain (p. 261): "Communism is inequality, but not as property is. Property is the exploitation of the weak by the strong. Communism is the exploitation of the strong by the weak. In property, inequality of conditions is the result of force, under whatever name it be disguised—physical and mental force; force of events, chance, fortune; force of accumulated property, etc. In communism, inequality springs from placing mediocrity on a level with excellence. This damaging equation is repellant to the conscience, and causes merit to complain; for, although it may be the duty of the strong to aid the weak, they

prefer to do it out of generosity. They never will endure a comparison. Give them equal opportunities of labor and equal wages, but never allow their jealousy to be awakened by mutual suspicion of unfaithfulness in the performance of a common task."

This is enough to show that he is no communist, although he holds a doctrine which communists also hold. What his opinions on other cognate topics are, this is not the place to set forth.

Another view of communism and socialism in their resemblances and differences, is said in a public journal to have been lately given by a brilliant lecturer, to which we must take exceptions. He defines the former of the two to be the doing away with inheritance, the family, nationality, religion, and property; socialism to be the doing away with the first four only. This is clear and distinct—as clear as the doing away with the five points of Calvinism to describe Arminianism; but we are compelled to make objections to the justness of the distinction. And first, as for *inheritance*, why put it at the beginning, when, if there is no property, there is nothing to inherit. As for *the family*, as yet no social bodies or associations, that we know of, which are widespread and ramified, have in modern times dared to attack the family. Jäger, one of the best writers on socialism, asserts expressly that "modern socialism, through those whom it has called upon as

its representatives, has never officially expressed itself concerning marriage ;” although he thinks that its principles tend in the direction of loosening the marriage tie. Next, as to *nationality*, it would be correct to say that some forms of this doctrine are international, while others are national ; but none expect, nor, so far as we are informed, seek to do away with the state. On the contrary, the social state would have all the powers now distributed through society in their highest potency. So of *religion*, that the principal supporters of socialism are atheists or pantheists is undoubted ; and yet the theory has not hitherto absorbed atheism into its organism. So much is true that it discards altogether any public or state religion, and regards religious faith as a matter of private conviction, to be professed by individuals ; that in the main it repels Christian believers from its pale by its godless tendencies ; but yet there have not been wanting in this age Christians who have tried to unite it with their holiest convictions. Finally, as to *property*, the doing away of private property is common to both communism and socialism, and, in fact, there is no theory of socialism thought of at present, so far as we know, in which questions of property do not occupy the first place and the “expropriation” of the holders of property does not really lie at the foundation of the system or systems. In proof of what we say, we will give here a definition of social-

ism, translated as literally as perspicuity will permit, from a work of a German political economist of no mean reputation: "The politico-economical quintessence of the socialistic programme," says he, "the proper aim of the international movement, is as follows: the replacement of private capital (that is, of the speculative, private method of production, which depends only on free competition) by 'collective capital'—that is, by a method of production which, upon the basis of the collective property of the sum of all the members of the society in the means of production, seeks to carry on a unitary (social, 'collective') organization of national work." Here he includes in his first sentence both what is called the socialistic and the international movements, and finds their end in the substitution of collective for private capital, using the collective property of the entire community so as to destroy all concurrence, and to effect a unitary organization of the work and, therefore, of the production of the whole nation. So that, if Schaeffle understands the movements in which Marx and Lassalle have been so prominent, our lecturer, to whom we referred, misunderstands it.

Thus the essence of both socialism and communism lies in the abolition of private property, either entirely or to such an extent that the private person ceases to have any control over it and the state takes his place. This is especially true

of everything by which human labor is assisted in production—that is, it is true of all machinery and of the soil. And thus all products are created under the supervision of the state, and pass over, or a portion of them passes over, to individual workmen, as their wages for their work.

We add one remark tending to help the understanding of the subject at this stage of our progress. Men will not stop in a theory which they hope to reduce to practice without looking forward, and, as it were, prophesying what shall be, when so immense a change as the abandonment of private property shall have passed over the world. But many crude ideas must be mingled in the speculations on such a subject. These speculations ought not to be confounded with the vagaries and chimeras of fervent minds. There never has been (we trust there never will be) any system of society answering in its principles and the vastness of its results to the theories and plans of socialism. This very vastness of the plan stimulates the imagination and makes possibilities seem real to dreamers. But all these must not be imputed to the scheme of society, as the soberest thinkers of the sect conceive of it. We may show necessary results, we may show probable results in opposing, just as others may do in advocating such untried measures. But we must not call it socialism when unpractical dreamers propose something in the way of promoting their

hopes which soberer men of the sect pronounce impossible. If a *bierschenk* reviles the wealthy over his lager, and arouses the passions of the laborers who spend their money at his counter against the *bourgeoisie*, another voice comes from thoughtful socialists, who profess to find the evils of society in the capital accumulated in a few hands, and would therefore make a sweeping revolution by abolishing private capital. It is these theorists who are most to be dreaded.

II.

We have defined communism and socialism to be in their essence the substitution of common, or public, or "collective" property for private property; that the state or the community is made the proprietor of all or of the principal means of production and of existing products—including, of course, the soil and whatever comes from it—instead of the private person or the association of private persons, uniting or separating by free consent. The consequences of such a complete overturn in the relations of individuals to production we cannot yet fitly consider. It is more important at this stage of our inquiries to try to find out whether there are not some subdivisions of communism, and thus to put ourselves on our guard against confounding together forms of society which differ in important respects.

1. But, first of all, the definition given above needs to be defended at one point. Admitting its truth, must we not admit also that partnerships in the freest society are a kind of common life, and do they not presuppose a common property? The answer is, that some forms of communistic society do resemble some forms of partnerships; but that there are essential differences between the two. One is, that partnership is a limited form of doing business which a single person, if he had the capital and ability, could do equally well. There is also nothing political about it. It is a creature of the state, and need not interfere with any of the state's powers. But the community, even on a small scale, cannot fail to obstruct the state in its proper office. For instance, it may control the family system, one department of private rights for the protection and free exercise of which states may be said to exist. Another difference is, that partnership is purely voluntary, a creature of law, generally temporary and terminable at will, without any intention, for the most part, of continuing its own existence indefinitely, and with no control of the firm over the conduct of the single partners, except so far as is necessary for prosecuting the business.

Still more resemblance does a community of slaves or serfs under a master bear to the communities of which we here speak. In the system of serfage the laborers are by law or usage perma-

nently connected with the soil. They cannot legally remove from it, or marry, or dispose of their crops or productions without the land-owner's consent. He may even have political rights over them, united with some of the rights he can exercise over slaves. The community may be so far isolated that the serf may have no uniting bond to the body politic except through his master. But here the property is all vested in the master, and can for the most part be alienated by him, or may be taken from him for political offences. In the system of slavery the property of the master includes the slave and his children, as well as the soil; and the state, while the system lasts, interferes only on the ground of humanity.

The Spartan commonwealth had not only a system of serfage, under which the state was the ultimate proprietor; but a division of land also to the original members of the body politic in equal portions, which at first they could not alienate. Besides this, the men had common meals as long as each member of a club could contribute his share of the expenses. There was also great looseness in regard to the marriage relation. But the individual Spartan became free at length to alienate his lands in his lifetime or by will; so that before the time of Aristotle vast inequalities existed in the estates, and the whole soil came into the hands of a few proprietors. This was in the end anything but communism.

But, passing on from this point, we come to the more important one of the different forms of communities. Here we notice first those early societies which were at an early period developed out of the family and consisted of blood-relatives. These communities were germs of tribes and expansions of the family. Within them crimes were punished and rights secured in a rude way ; but no right of property as between the members was very definitely settled, while, as far as a similar neighboring community was concerned, the possessions of the community were defended by force. Land for the purposes of cultivation had no value. Products there were next to none, and still less did division of labor exist. The family was, so to speak, held in solution in the great family or community. We cannot afford to go further into the details of these early institutions, which have been investigated by Bachofen, McLennan, Lubbock, Morgan, Girard-Teulon, and others. Nor can we more than mention the later forms which appear in several parts of the world where the lands within a *hundred*, or other small districts, or at least meadow-lands and forests, have been held in common even until modern times ; and where for a long period the plough-lands were exchanged among the inhabitants from year to year. For communities under these forms Sir Henry S. Maine, Laveleye, and others must be consulted. In these, as well as in the communi-

ties first mentioned, the starting-point was the family. In the first form the necessity of self-defence must have been the main cause of the common life in contiguous settlements. In the second, the village communities being a part of a tribe or union, and being now devoted to agriculture, as well as pasturage, houses and lands adjoining became personal property; although there was a time in some races when these were exchanged from year to year. As soon, then, as houses and lands had a value, private property to a very great extent was recognized all over the world.

These early communities teach us little. *The second* communistic form is that which has arisen *within the state*, whenever, for various reasons, small bodies of men make a common stock and live a life severed from the rest of the society. This is not an unfrequent phenomenon in the history of mankind. The most common cause for their existence has been either the ascetic, or in some way the religious principle, whether it appears in the contemplative life of the Buddhist mendicant order, in the institutions of the Esenes, and among the various kinds of Christian monks; or in a more fanatical form, as among the Anabaptists under John of Leyden; or in associations of dreamers for establishing societies after a certain idea, like Cabet's colony in Texas; or for industrial purposes, like that of Owen.

Many of these are full of interest, and would reward study. Some few of them may be noticed hereafter.

It is to be observed, however, that all of these may form parts of states, just as towns and villages do, except that they are not separate *political* communities. There never has been a *state consisting of such communities, and of such only*. The state protects them and their property, and society stands aloof from them, as they stand aloof from society. It is impossible that in such a position they should not receive ideas from the larger community under whose shadow they live. Hence, all conclusions from their conduct and history are subject to some doubt. We may always ask whether such communities have acted out their genuine nature; whether the world outside of their pale has not repressed some evil, has not prevented their principles from running to an extreme, and infused some good into them. Sometimes, also, they have lasted so short a time that no sure judgment can be formed concerning what fruit they would bear if time were given them.

A *third communistic* form would be that of a *communistic or socialistic state*, with all power put into the hands of the upturners of existing society to carry out their principles as they wished. But, unfortunately for mankind in the future, there have been no such communities in

the past. History has no voice to utter concerning *communistic states*. That awful thing, private property, has lorded it since a little after the era of the cave-dwellers until now. And just in this consists the power and plausibility of socialism. They can tell the operative that, if only the theory is made practical, his fortune will be made; or, as Mr. Most, who has been a member of the German Parliament, tells them, a man will need only to work ten years, from his eighteenth to his twenty-eighth year, to be supported by the socialistic state for the rest of his life.

Thus we see that another division can be made for practical uses, between communistic forms *which have been tested by experience*, and those *that exist as mere theories*. These latter are of incomparably vaster importance than all the others that have been thought of since the beginning of the creation. They have also this peculiarity, that, whilst the old experiments proceeded from some philosophical or religious conviction, which adds dignity and worth to them, the new experiments, which amount to an absolute overthrow of all existing political institutions, are applications chiefly of principles of political economy, which, to say the least, are not so certain of success as to justify a complete revolution.

But we are anticipating what we might better say by and by. At present we must look at the history and results of the communistic system as

it has shown itself by actual experiment ; then at the theories and plans for a new order of things, which have not been submitted to trial. Much of this matter we may lightly pass over. It will then be necessary to examine far more fully the schemes which are now agitating the world.

CHAPTER II.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES WITHIN A STATE.

I.

BUDDHIST MONKS—ESSENES—THERAPEUTÆ.

WE have already remarked that there is an abundance of materials furnished to us by history, for showing the nature and workings of small societies, united in a common life by some one principle or motive. A large number of these societies were formed by persons of the ascetic or contemplative sort, who expected some great good, especially some religious good, from seclusion. In the order of time the anchorite or hermit was earlier than the community of monks. If seclusion from the corruptions of the world, with opportunity for contemplation and religious exercises, could be united to help derived from others of a like spirit—the advantages of solitude, and those of a society separated from the unthinking mass of men, would be equally secured; and a certain description of persons who had a natural turn for solitude, or expected to purify their souls

by contemplation, or were soured by disappointments, or disgusted with ordinary life, would here find some solace together.

These communities began extensively in the free union of anchorites, who united by and by, with equal freedom, in associations where rules and promises or vows were found necessary, in order that the common good might be promoted. As it regarded supplies for the bodily wants, either soliciting alms from others or industry within the communities themselves was the original means by which these needs were met. The demands made on others might be very small, for the earliest plan was to live within the narrowest bounds of human necessities; and, moreover, an industrious life might seem to be inconsistent with the great spiritual end which the communities had in view. By and by, in some countries, the life of self-denial and of religious contemplation and prayer, unattainable by the mass of men, would naturally cause these monks to be revered; permanent funds would be given to them, houses would be provided for their shelter, and orders would bring together in different parts, where the same religion was professed, great numbers who were governed by the same rule.

It is easy to see that the fundamental rules were pointed out by reflection on human nature and by experience of the evil that is in the world.

There are two very strong desires in man—that of wealth or the means of self-gratification, and the sexual instinct. Whatever end be proposed in a life remote from the world, whether it be the extinction of desire, or closer communion with God, or escape from the corruption that is in the world through lust, or a longing for serenity and peace of soul, or the realization of an idea of virtue which men in society cannot well reach: these two classes of desire are the principal ones to be held in restraint, or, if possible, extinguished; these are the main tyrants, in a corrupt society especially, which enslave the soul. Hence the vows or, at least, the rules of chastity and poverty are universal, in all the forms of common life to which we here have reference; and they were taken even by orders or bodies of priests or priestesses who did not constitute communities. The vow of obedience also to a superior, elected by the members of the community or in some other way set over them, was generally but not always required.

Among these communities a very early order was that of the Buddhist monks, who were at first simply the mendicants whom Gautama gathered around him in his solitude. These were at the outset to have nothing but their rags, their begging-bowl, a razor, a needle, and a water-strainer; but ere long, like the monks in Christian convents, they could as a body possess books,

lands, and houses, given to them by private munificence. Houses were almost necessary in the rainy season. The vows they took upon themselves were poverty and chastity—the latter so strictly guarded that it was held to be unlawful even to touch a woman, however nearly related. Obedience to a superior in the convent or community consisted in conformity rather to the rules of the order than to a superior's bidding. When the vow or the rules are violated, a member may be expelled from the body, or may have some penance imposed on him upon his confession of his offence. Mr. Rhys Davids says that "charges may be brought against a monk for breach of the ordinances laid down in the Pitakas [or sacred books], and must be examined by a chapter; but no one can change or add to the existing law or claim obedience from any novice."

The originating motive for Buddhism in the mind of Gautama or Buddha and its success are due especially to the weight with which transmigration pressed on the Indian mind. Successive lives depended for their condition on the sins and virtues of a previous life; but all life was unreality and illusion, the complete escape from which was the highest good. Such escape could be effected only by killing desire, and this extinction of desire could be effected only by meditation and self-denial. The reward was, that there would be no new birth; that an end could come to the

illusive dream of existence. It is strange that anchorites, who only meditated and supplied their most absolutely necessary wants, could spread a religion which embraces more followers than any other. But the explanation, in part, at least, lies first in this doctrine that the new birth might at length come to an end, and that existence in a world full of illusions might give place to nonentity; next, in the abolition of caste—in other words, in the breaking away from the fundamental institutions of Brahminism; then in the mild and benevolent morality of the founders of Buddhism. The abolition of caste made it possible, while the religion was in its infancy in India, to admit all men of all castes into its pale; and the same liberty, together with other causes given above, made its spread possible through surrounding nations. This spread was due to the mendicant order, which was not a caste or a body of priests, but a simple fraternity. Originally, the mendicant order was all of Buddhism that existed. But wide expansion of such a kind of anchorites was impossible, in a world where industry and marriage are forced on the majority of men by the commands of their nature. The Buddhists had to yield to this. In converting men to their moral maxims and to freedom from caste, they had to allow the existence of a kind of laity, which was not bound by the rules of the mendicants. And what was, perhaps, as important—

when the religion, being overcome in a great struggle with Brahminism, was driven out of India and spread its doctrine in other countries; the great mass of the converted population, or that which venerated Buddha, received the moral precepts and fell under control of the monks, was left to its superstitions and its old divinities and spirits to a very considerable extent. This could be done, because the gods themselves were subject to the same laws of existence with men, and because in Buddhism there was no God in our sense of the word, no providence, no prayer, nothing but atheism.

The mendicants, we have seen, were at an early date allowed to possess houses, and formed close settlements or social unions. In Thibet, after a long struggle, they formed a hierarchy, with wealthy and populous religious houses, under superintendents, like the abbots of Romanism, and under an infallible head, the Dalai Lama, in whom the spirit of Buddha or the Buddhas became incarnate. Supreme temporal power was given to him by the Mogul Emperor Kubilai Khan, in the thirteenth century; but the destinies of this impostor have varied since they fell under the control of the Chinese Government.

Another very different set of communities, small at their acme in number, but remarkable on more than one account, are the Essenes, who appeared in Judea not long before the birth of Christ.

They are known to us from the accounts which Philo the Jew, and Josephus have given in their works. Of their origin, their opinions, and their relation to Jewish opinion and heathen sects we intend to say next to nothing, except that they show some influences derived from the Persian religion, or Parsism, and that no connection whatever can be traced between them and our Lord or his apostles. Those who can follow the arguments of Dr. Lightfoot in his commentary on the Colossians, will find there the most instructive essay on this sect which has hitherto been given to the world.

The Essenes numbered, according to Philo, about four thousand in all, and preferred to live in villages rather than in cities, on account of the corruption of the latter. They are spoken of by Pliny the Elder, who has a very imperfect knowledge of them, as dwelling not far from the western shore of the Dead Sea; but apparently these were scattered and remote from one another. All authorities agree that they held to community of goods and of products of the industry of each member of the society; but it would seem that they had no common bond uniting the several communities together. A treasurer is spoken of by Josephus as taking care of the funds in each society, and a common headman was chosen by the vote of the members of each. Marriage was not in use among them, not

that they looked on it or on inheritance as institutions to be abolished, but because, as Josephus says, they feared the wanton conduct and unfaithfulness of the female sex. Hence, they recruited their communities by adopting boys to be trained up under their rules. There was, however, a portion of the Essenes, the same author says, who differed in no respect from the rest, except that they allowed marriage in their communities, "for the reason that those who do not marry cut off succession and descent, which constitute the leading features of life." But they subjected the women who were to be married to a long probation, to see whether they were likely to be fruitful.

The distinctive peculiarities of the Essenes, as it respects worship, were very great veneration for the Sabbath, abstinence from sacrifices at the temple,—although they sent offerings thither,—and a certain kind of reverence for the sun, which came near to idolatry. They had prophetic persons, and, it is said, magic arts among them. They were constant and particular in their ablutions. As a mild sect, more contemplative than fanatical, not taking pains to propagate their doctrines, but rather living by themselves, and yet kind to strangers, they remind one of the Shaker communities in the United States, who, when most prosperous, have not differed greatly in number from Philo's estimate of the Essenes.

Very similar to the Essenes were the Therapeutæ, whom Philo the Jew, in his brief essay on the contemplative life, speaks of as being scattered over all the districts of Egypt. They must have been Jews, who were under the influence of Platonism, and, like Philo himself, to some extent, of Oriental philosophy. He describes a settlement on the sea-coast, near Alexandria, as composed of men and women who had given up their property and left their kindred for the purpose "of avoiding unprofitable intercourse with persons of characters and habits unlike their own." They live in scattered houses, he says, but near enough to each other for defence against robbers. They spend their time, from the morning prayer at sunrise until the evening prayer at sunset, in meditation and study of ancient books, oracles of prophets, and the like. Their meals are nothing but bread and salt. They hold no slaves, thinking slavery to be contrary to nature. In each house is a chapel or sanctuary, where they spend the six days in meditation; but on the Sabbath they meet in an apartment provided with a low wall running through its length, in order to keep the females from observation. In their solemn feasts the singing of sacred hymns seems to have been the principal act of worship. Hymns are struck up by one and another, in the choral parts and refrains of which both sexes join. The unleavened bread, together with salt and hyssop, is

brought in on a table representing, it would seem, that table where the shew-bread was placed in the temple, of which they partake. After this a sacred vigil is kept, in memory of the passage through the Red Sea. Hymns follow, in which the men and women form choirs, first apart and then together. This lasts until sunrise, when they stretch forth their hands, "pray for prosperity, truth, and sharpness of intellectual vision," and then part.

These *Therapeutæ* differ from the Essenes in allowing both sexes to live in the same communities, although without marriage and in a strictly abstemious and ascetic life. Of industry pursued in their settlements Philo says nothing. They were, doubtless, called forth by much the same causes which gave rise to the Essenes. The time of their origin is unknown; but they must have been such as Philo describes them long before Christ began his ministry.

II.

THE CHRISTIAN MONASTIC SYSTEM.

The examples thus far given, of societies constructed on the communistic plan within the state, show the power of religious opinions and ideas to bring men into societies separate from the masses of men around them, and to do this with no political or pecuniary object in view. Our next

example is still more remarkable. The monastic system of the ancient church, both in the East and in the West, is a most important chapter in ecclesiastical history, on account of its tenacity of life and its vast influence for good as well as for evil, and because it could not have grown up in a pure, enlightened Christian church. As in papacy, so here the seemingly good and innocent nature of the system lent strength to false principles, which had no necessary connection with the spirit and principles of the gospel. These false principles took hold of supports which belonged to an age and to its way of thinking, in order to construct institutions which have lasted until this day; and which, although they have reached senile weakness, are still a strong if not a chief power in several decaying churches.

A community of goods is an essential feature of all kinds of communism. What shall we say, then, when it is asserted that the community of goods in the early Christian church at Jerusalem, just after the death of Christ, is a sufficient reason for the rise of monachism? We say, first, that this community was not a *close*, but rather a *changing* community, consisting of families obedient to no law of union, no vow or other tie save the fellowship of the gospel. Again, it was *voluntary*. No one was obliged to sell his goods to feed the poor; but, although governed by a strong public feeling, was free to follow what was right.

“While it remained [unsold] was it not thine own; and when it was sold, was it not in thine own power?” is the question of Peter to Ananias. Again, it was *local*. There is no evidence that it existed beyond Jerusalem. Among the Hebrew Christians, to whom James wrote, there were great inequalities of property. Paul, writing to Timothy, at Ephesus, uses the words “Charge them that are rich among you;” and the Gentile Christians were well enough off to send their contributions to the poor at Jerusalem. And, finally, it was *temporary*. When there was no centre and capital any longer; when, we may add, there was no longer an immediate expectation of an end of the existing order of things in society—it turned into such general charity as is now called forth by Christian love. Nor was a *single* life thought to be essential to the Christian profession. Paul led such a life; but claimed the right to have a wife, like Peter and other apostles, if he thought it best. His advice to the Christians at Corinth is against seeking husbands for their daughters; yet this advice is dictated, in part, at least, by the “present distress,” or the state of the times. In other circumstances he urges that woman should marry, and even that young widows should marry again; which, although allowed, was not approved even by the heathen Romans. He makes it one of the marks of a departure from the faith, that the speakers of lies

should forbid men to marry and command to abstain from meats (1 Tim. iv. 2, 3). And, to dwell no longer on this point, the same apostle finds an apt symbol of the union of man and wife in the union of Christ and the church. From one passage only of the New Testament (Matt. xix. 12) can we infer that a pure single life is not only allowable, but even praiseworthy, for those who can lead it for the kingdom of heaven's sake, which we certainly would be far from denying; and in another (Rev. xiv. 4) there is praise of absolute purity, which, however, cannot fairly be pressed as teaching the inferiority of a married to a single life. Nor is there anywhere any encouragement in the Christian Scriptures to vows, and to associations built upon them, within the church.

We may add the remark that the formation of close unions, shut out from intercourse with the world, meets with no favor from the *spirit and institutions* of the New Testament. The believers were expected to assemble together, as brethren and members of a common Master. They were on an equality, and there was no esoteric class, no persons or coteries of superior sanctity, who were to do the praying for their fellow-Christians. The thought, that Christians lived and acted like other men in outward things, is well expressed in the epistle to Diognetus, belonging to the second century. "The Christians, neither

in speech nor in place of abode, nor in usages of life, differ from their fellow-men. For nowhere do they dwell in cities of their own, nor make use of dialects peculiar to themselves, nor observe a singular mode of life. They marry, like all men, and bear children; but they do not expose their infants," etc.

Christianity, then, was no more the native soil of monachism than the Jewish religion was the proper birthplace of what was ascetic and monastic among the Essenes. The true origin was in that tendency of the age towards a solitary and contemplative life, as being the only life suited to the attainment of truth and virtue, which began some time before the Christian era, and diffused itself like some epidemic from the East, with the help of some of the Greek philosophical systems. We have shown how the contemplative and ascetic spirit was spread over Egypt in the small communities of the *Therapeutæ*. It was in Egypt that Philo the Jew gave an allegorical, mystical sense to the historical parts of the Old Testament. It was here that the first Christian anchorites sought the wilderness, aloof from towns, and gave themselves up to contemplation. Anthony, in the third century, was the most conspicuous example, and his fame, as a spiritual Christian, led other Christians to settle near him in order to enjoy the benefit of his advice and society. Here we have the Buddhist history acted over again,

for, in the fourth century Pachomius (who had been in the military service, and had an idea of organization, perhaps from his former employment), made an improvement on the form of solitary life then existing. In the place of anchorites, living near one another, but with no bond of union except their common religious views and objects, he devised the plan of a body of men forming a common association, supporting themselves by common industry, undergoing a novitiate, taking vows, and subjected to an abbot. His society of monks on an island in the Nile is said to have had seven thousand members before his death; and in the fifth century fifty thousand men are said to have been obedient to its rules. As the cloisters spread, the society was kept up; the abbot of the original Cœnobium being the head of the body, and the abbots of the other houses meeting together in council to keep up the organization. Cloisters of nuns also were instituted during the life of Pachomius; so that before his death almost all that was characteristic of Christian monachism, communities with branches, or orders, embracing in separate places the two sexes, rules, vows—a compact system, in short, of government—had been developed.

Of the monastic system in its distinct orders spread over the world; of the vast wealth which belonged to the religious houses; of the use of monasteries in learning, education, and the relief

of the poor ; of the eminent services of many abbots to letters ; of the lights and shades of their religious life ; of the introduction of the begging and preaching friars ; of the last stroke of worldly wisdom in the institution of the order of the Jesuits ; of the services of the monks in maintaining the papal system,—of these and other results of monasticism we can say nothing. We confine ourselves to the simple inquiry how the communistic plan of life stood related to the great influences of the orders of monks upon the Christian world.

If the life of the anchorite had never given way to the conventual life, the type of religion would have become much more distorted than it actually was. The hermit in his loneliness was exposed to all kinds of vagaries of the imagination ; to temptations which he would not have been called to encounter in society ; to spiritual pride and self-righteousness. If, instead of a solitary life, in which industry for self-support and communion with nature might keep his mind in a somewhat healthy condition, he should have gone about like a Buddhist mendicant ; the burden of relieving the wants of such a class would have been so great—supposing them to amount to only one or two per cent. of the grown-up male population—that it would have reacted for evil on the condition of the regular parish priest. The venerable beggar, if he came into frequent contact

with the people, would either, through his supposed sanctity, have undermined the influence of the stated teachers in parishes; or by his fanaticism, extravagance, and other peculiarities, made religion contemptible. But, on the other hand, the monks in a convent, by the society which they held with one another, must have prevented many extravagances, must have kept the minds of all in a healthier frame and made them better models to their fellow-men.

The influence of a common life was, of course, far greater for good than that of the life of so many hermits. The latter depended for the good they could do on their own uncorrected individual convictions, which were generally colored with fanaticism; and on the general impression which their austerity and self-restraint made on persons, whose place in the world prevented them from practising the ascetic virtues. But in the convent each member carried with him the weight and authority of a body which was conceived to be learned, holy, and pure. There was, again, among the monks no such separation from mankind that they could not understand mankind. Many of the ablest men, some of the Popes in the Catholic Church, and even some of the adroitest negotiators and political managers came from the monastic orders.

It may be added that in the cloisters the aged monks of approved life would often be great

helps to the novices, and that all, to some extent, must have watched over one another. They seem often to have had an interest too intense in the prosperity of their own community ; but their regard for its reputation was by no means an unmixed evil. The solitary hermit could feel no such motives, and was as far away from the family state as possible. In the convents something like family feeling was encouraged. The ordinary members were brethren, hence called friars, in French *frères*, and on an equality in the household. The abbot, prior, or other superior, was something like a father, as, indeed, the abbot's name implies. If wealth, literary culture, and even political importance brought degeneracy into many monasteries, this shows, indeed, that the system had in itself, without a permanent purifying power, seeds of decay ; but, with all this, it accomplished a vast amount of good, which depended greatly on its peculiar social element.

We shall next consider some of the modern communities ; after which a brief view will be taken of what may be called ideal communism, or the communism constructed by philosophers.

III.

ANABAPTISTS OF MÜNSTER.

In a small community the governing principle will be more intense, for the most part, than the controlling idea will be on which a large society is constructed. If we want to find an exaggeration of the patriotic or the fanatical spirit, we must look for the first in the city states of Greece, or of mediæval Italy; and for the other in those compact settlements where, for some reason or other, the perverted religious spirit has for a time gained control. An instance of such control is offered to us by that chapter of the history of the Reformation, which has for its subject the Anabaptists at Münster, during their short sway over that ill-fated place. A word or two will be of use for connecting this affair with its originating causes.

These causes are to be traced back to the mystical and enthusiastic doctrines, together with the revolutionary movements and the denial of the validity of infant baptism, which characterized the early Anabaptists. They may all be reduced to false Spiritualism, Antinomianism, and a return to the Jewish standpoint. Thomas Münzer, a parish priest at Zwickau, in Saxony, in 1521, and there connected with the Zwickau prophets

so called, was obliged to leave his place and found a new one at Alstedt, in Thuringia, in 1524. Here he was willing to have infant baptism and other ceremonies retained ; but his unquiet, tumultuary spirit made him obnoxious to Luther and to the civil ruler, so that he was again afloat. In a sermon here preached before Duke John of Saxony, he called upon the princes to root out the ungodly with force and without mercy. The ungodly, he said, have no right to live, save what the elect will grant them.

From Alstedt, Münzer went to place after place in South Germany ; but his chief activity was concentrated at Mühlhausen, then pertaining to Saxony, where the people, driving away the regular ministers, chose him as pastor of the Marienkirche, in 1525, and at his suggestion revolutionized the town administration. The Peasant's War had broken out and raged all around Mühlhausen. He joined in the movement, was taken prisoner, and soon suffered death.

The mysticism and spiritualism of Münzer led him to hold to immediate communications from God ; and the written word he made light of in comparison. He thought little of water baptism, and is said to have held that infant baptism was not of God ; indeed his followers began to rebaptize before he did (Gieseler). He interpreted the Scriptures literally, and, as we have seen, was ready to root out by persecution the "ungodly."

The kingdom of God on earth was to be built on equality and community of goods.

The most relentless persecution arose against the Anabaptists, and in consequence they were scattered abroad in Germany and the Netherlands.

Besides the tenet after which they are called and on which they agreed, the Anabaptists seem to have had no very distinct set of opinions. Some held that the flesh alone sinned; the spirit at the Fall had not fallen with it. Some believed that Christ redeemed men only by leading them to follow his footsteps; while some went further, and denied his divinity. Some thought infant baptism useless only; others thought that it was an abomination. Some regarded military service and the oath to be unlawful; the former because killing, the latter because swearing was always a sin. Some thought that marriage in the spirit alone was valid; and a furrier, named Claus Frei, putting away his wife, went about with another woman, whom he called his "only right spiritual sister" (Ranke). All found the government of the church by magistrates and preachers to be intolerable. Every man ought to be allowed to preach; then there would be no divisions. The institutions of the Evangelicals were nothing but a new papacy. They believed, however, that all this was to be done away. The kingdom of God was soon to come.

The commotions at Münster proceeded first from Rottmann, a chaplain of the cathedral church there—a man to whom Melancthon imputes, perhaps unjustly, the crime of taking off one of the syndics of the place by poison, that he might get possession of his beautiful wife. Rottmann and the other ministers were in controversy with the town council; and Ranke thinks that they looked for support to the Anabaptists, who were growing in number among the people, and who found in the city a favorable reception. Near the end of 1533 the town was filled with strangers of this sect from the Netherlands; and in February of the next year they, with their partisans, occupied the market-place, while the council and the people holding with the council, who were superior in number, took possession of the walls and gates. The result was the victory of their party. It was agreed that liberty of faith should be conceded to every one, so long as the peace was kept and obedience rendered to the magistrates. The Anabaptists now gained the town by success at the election for a new town council, their electors having the majority; and so the whole power was in the hands of this faction, and Knipperdolling, a friend of Rottmann's, was chosen burgo-master (Feb. 21st, 1534).

This success was followed in a few days (Feb. 27th) by a plot of the Anabaptists to drive the other faction out of the city. Armed men appear

in the market-place. A prophet cries out: "Away with the children of Esau. The inheritance belongs to the seed of Jacob." Then the cry ran through the streets: "Out with the ungodly." They seem to have made clean work with the old inhabitants, including, of course, most of the principal citizens. No member of the other faction was exempted from banishment. All pictures, books, manuscripts, and musical instruments were destroyed. One of the leaders in this *coup d'état* was Jan, or John Matthys, a prophet who had come from the Netherlands, and was accompanied by Jan Bockhold, or Bockelson, better known as John of Leyden. Matthys held the first place of authority in the town a few weeks—*i. e.*, until Easter of 1534, when he was killed in a sally against the bishop and the princes who were besieging Münster. During this interval between the sole occupation of the town by the Anabaptists and the death of Matthys a new constitution, so to speak, was made. "A religious element," remarks Ranke, "such as in one way or another has appeared in more than one century, was developed here in a narrow circle, but within that circle with entire freedom, and found a vent for itself in the most remarkable phenomena."

We will let the distinguished historian speak of the new order of things in his own words: "Among the Anabaptists themselves all was to be common. The measures taken in regard to

the goods of the banished was soon applied to the property of the believers. On pain of death, they were required to deliver up to the chancelry their gold and silver ornaments and ready money (or property) for the common use. The conception of property ceased; but still every one was obliged to follow his own industry. We have the statutes remaining in which the journeymen shoemakers and the tailors are particularly mentioned. The latter are required to see that no new style of clothes shall creep in. Every trade was considered as at once a commission and an office. Of all employments the principal, as is readily understood, was the defence of the city. All together formed a religious, military family. Meat and drink were provided at the common cost. At meals the two sexes, 'brothers and sisters,' sat apart from one another. They ate in silence while a chapter was read in the Bible."

John of Leyden at this time was not thirty years old, and had, in his wandering life as a journeyman tailor, in his trade as a merchant dealing with Lisbon, and also as a beer-seller, seen a good deal of mankind; nor was he without some literary cultivation. John Matthys had baptized him; he had learned something from the writings of Melchior Hoffmann, one of the leaders among the Anabaptists; he had a tolerable knowledge of the Scriptures. His vivid imagination and imposing form made him popu-

lar. He was put into the place of Matthys by his own act, and probably by some kind of election. For a time he did not reveal his plans. At length he declared that twelve elders must be appointed over the new Israel (as there were twelve persons, one from each tribe, in the old Israel), who should be overseers and judges. Their decisions were to be made known to the congregation through him, and were to be executed by Knipperdolling. Soon he wanted a new law to be passed that, as in the ancient people of God, so in the new one, in order to produce a holy seed, every man should be allowed to take more wives than one. Rottmann, who had gone along with the fanatics, accepted this project also and supported it by his sermons. John of Leyden had private views of his own in getting this law passed. He was married, but had conceived a passion for the young widow of Matthys, for whom the latter had forsaken his wife. Afterward he added new wives, so that his harem amounted to some seventeen.

It was this step which led to an *emeute*, which was put down with the loss of some two hundred lives. Having advanced thus far, he succeeded in taking one step more. He wished to be king, after the pattern in the Old Testament. A prophet declared that he had learned from God by a revelation that John, as king of a new Israel, was to reign over the whole earth, and to

set up again the throne of David. John himself then confirmed the words by saying that the same revelation had been made to him. The royal title was conferred on him. He assumed royal state, and took a house for his queen and the other sixteen women.

These events must have taken place in the summer and autumn of 1534. In October the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the market-place, at which more than four thousand were present. John served the bread to the men, and his wife, Divara, the widow of Matthys, to the women. At the table John saw a stranger who did not have on a wedding-garment. He rose from his seat, conceiving him to be a spy, cut his head off, and went back to the Supper.

The siege of Münster dragged along through this year (1534), and as the place was well provided with necessaries, there was no immediate prospect of its reduction. The Roman King Ferdinand now decided to lend his aid; but no successful attempt to take the place by storm was made until the summer of 1535, although the people within the walls began to feel the extremities of famine. In June two deserters led forces of the enemy over the walls by night, a gate was broken open, and after a desperate contest the city came into the hands of the bishop and princes. Rottmann found his death in the affray; but John of Leyden was taken captive and put to

death, after defending his opinions on baptism, polygamy, and community of goods by the Scriptures.

It is perhaps idle to speculate on the probable condition of Münster if it had been safe from the assaults of enemies. The probability is that the principal leaders would, by the help of their pretended prophecies, have turned into intolerable tyrants, and met with some due punishment from the men of their own faith, when their wickedness had become full. As for the community of goods in so considerable a population, it does not seem probable that, with an administration such as that existing at Münster, it could have been long maintained, even if the Anabaptists had secured peace with their neighbors. Nor could the faith in the prophets have long continued.

IV.

THE SHAKERS IN THE UNITED STATES.

The history of communism receives valuable contributions from experiments that have been made in the United States. Although the first settlers came chiefly from a class in society and a land which held individual property in high honor, yet in the early times of the colony in Virginia there was properly no separate ownership of land, but only ownership of shares in the company.

This departure from the rule of private property, although not an extreme one, was attended with disastrous results. A single man did only about a third of a fair day's work, and the system of separate proprietorship was introduced after four years of trial.

From the time of the first settlements until the age of the Revolution, if there were any communistic societies founded, I have met with no account of them. The first, which has had a long life, was that of the Shakers, or Shaking Quakers, as they were at first called, on account of their bodily movements in worship. The members of this sect or society left England in 1774, and have prospered ever since. It has now multiplied into settlements—twelve of them in New York and New England—in regard to which we borrow the following statistics from Mr. Nordhoff's book on communistic societies in the United States, published in 1875. Their property consists of 49,335 acres of land in home farms, with other real estate. The value of their houses and personal property is not given. The population of all the communities consists of 695 male and 1,189 female adults, with 531 young persons under twenty-one, of whom 192 are males and 339 females, amounting in all to 2,415 in 1874. The maximum of population was 5,069, a decline to less than half, for which we are not able to account save on the supposition that there are permanent

causes of decay now at work within the communities. One of them, that at Tyringham, Mass., has lately been disbanded.

The other communities (except the Oneida and Wallingford settlements of the Perfectionists, which are strictly indigenous, and the Shakers, who are of English origin) are of non-English extraction. That is, they originated in movements, either of Germans or of others holding peculiar views, to find a religious and social liberty on this side of the water, which was not possible in their own country; or they represent the social opinions of some of the great lights of Europe in that department of philosophy. Of these, eleven belong to what Mr. Noyes, the founder of the Perfectionist communities, in his history of American Socialisms (1870), calls the Owen group, created either personally by Robert Owen or to be traced back to his influence. All of these eleven settlements have miserably failed, and the average duration of eight of the principal ones is about a year and a half.

The communities founded in a degree on the "rule" of Fourier, in or after the year 1843, when the system of this Frenchman began to be preached and reduced to experiment, were in all about thirty-four. All of these have now entirely disappeared, and a large number of them lasted only a few months. We must not believe, however, that any of that freedom between the sexes

was contemplated or allowed in them, which Fourier himself would have permitted without shame. Nor were these settlements properly communistic; since labor, capital, and skill were all factors in the scheme of the first founder. We may pass them by, therefore; and have need only to say of the colony founded by Cabet, author of a Utopia called the "Voyage to Icaria," that in 1850 he led a colony to Nauvoo, after the Mormons were driven away; that in 1856 the leader went to St. Louis, with some of his followers, leaving the rest at the first home of the body; that these dispersed ere long, some of them forming a new settlement near Corning, in Iowa, which, when Mr. Nordhoff saw it, consisted of only sixty-five members, in eleven families. These people were chiefly French in extraction, of a nationality which finds it hard to maintain colonies in new conditions of life; and the founder seems to have been a theorist, incompetent to lead the way in a new organization. It ought to be mentioned, however, for his credit, that he required his colonists to marry and live in the family state.

From these abortive attempts to establish communities in the territory of the United States we turn to others which are more successful. The oldest, the Shakers, were at their origin a society of enthusiasts in humble life, who separated from the Quakers about the middle of the eighteenth century. Ann Lee, one of the members, on ac-

count of spiritual manifestations believed to have been made to her, became an oracle in the body ; and in 1773 she declared that a revelation from heaven instructed her to go to America. The next year she crossed the sea, with eight others, and settled in the woods of Watervliet, near Albany. She preached, and was believed to have performed remarkable cures. From her were derived the rule of celibacy, and, for persons seeking admission into the infant society, the obligation to make an oral confession of sin in the presence of an older member of the community. She died in 1784, as the acknowledged head of the church ; and had afterward nearly equal honors paid to her with the Saviour. Under the second successor of Ann Lee almost all the societies in New York and New England were founded ; and under the third, a woman named Lucy Wright, whose leadership lasted nearly thirty years, those in Ohio and Kentucky. The latter grew up during the remarkable revivals in Kentucky at the beginning of the century, which were attended with involuntary convulsions of the body. After 1830 the Shakers founded no new society.

Mr. Nordhoff gives the leading doctrines of the Shakers, which are, some of them, singular enough. They hold that God is a dual person, male and female ; that Adam, created in his image, was dual also ; that the same is true of all angels and spirits ; and that Christ is one of the highest of spir-

its, who appeared first in the person of Jesus and afterward in that of Ann Lee. There are four heavens and four hells. Noah went to the first heaven, and the wicked of his time to the first hell. The second heaven was called Paradise, and contained the pious Jews until the appearance of Christ. The third, that into which the Apostle Paul was caught, included all that lived until the time of Ann Lee. The fourth is now being filled up, and "is to supersede all the others."

They hold that the day of judgment, or beginning of Christ's kingdom on earth, began with the establishment of their church, and will go on until it is brought to its completion. The Pentecostal Church, they think, was the standard and true church, from which the Christians fell away; but the Shaker community has returned to the true doctrine and practice. Its main principles were common property, celibacy, non-resistance, a separate government [from that of the state?], and power over diseases. All these they embody in their system except the last, which also they have a hope of receiving. They discard the doctrine of the Trinity, the resurrection of the body, and the Atonement. They worship neither Christ nor Ann Lee; but pay both love and reverence.

They have a belief that a sinless life is within human reach, and that to this "all their members ought to attain."

In regard to marriage and property, they do not take the position that these are crimes; but only marks of a lower order of society. The world will have a chance to become pure in a future state as well as here.

They believe in spiritual communication and possession. They themselves have conversed with spirits—even with those that lived before the Flood. They claim that inspired gifts have been granted to their churches. In the earlier times of the sect they professed to have the gift of tongues.

The travels of President Dwight make mention of this gift of tongues in a letter of the author written as early as 1799 (Vol. III., p. 161). I give his words: "The company at whose worship I was present declared that they could speak with tongues, and that both the words and the tune were inspired. I observed to them that the sounds which they made, and which they called language, could not be words, because they were not articulated. One of the women replied: 'How dost thee know but that we speak the Hotmatot language? The language of the Hotmatots is said to be made up of such sort of words.'"

Dr. Dwight in the same place gives statements from the work of one Thomas Brown, once a Quaker, and for a time a member of the Society of Shakers, but afterward dismissed from their

body. This book, published in 1798, gives very disparaging accounts of the morality of Ann Lee and her brother, William Lee, and says of the society that they esteem it lawful to lie, to defraud, and quote Scripture falsely, for the good of the church—lawful for the elders, at least, if not for the brethren. Another charge is that they retain the property and refuse to pay for the labor of such as leave them, alleging for it the reason that they will only spend it on their lusts. But these and similar charges against their character eighty years ago must be received with many grains of allowance, if not entirely disbelieved; both because they come from a man who was expelled from the community after living seven years in it; and because, in later times, no such charges, so far as we know, have been renewed on good evidence.

Dr. Dwight himself seeks to do them justice. "Probably," says he, "there never was a sillier enthusiasm than this; yet, by a singular combination of circumstances, it has become to society the most harmless, and in some respects the most useless, perhaps, of all the mental extravagances of this nature recorded in history. The doctrines are so gross that they never can spread far; while the industry, manual skill, fair dealing, and orderly behavior of the brotherhood render them useful members of society."

The Shakers (leaving out of sight for the pres-

ent the children from abroad, who are brought up) consist of two orders: novices, or such as are not full members of the community, and full members. The latter are not easily accessible to strangers in their houses. All communication with travellers and others whose curiosity draws them to the Shaker settlements takes place at the houses where the novices are lodged. When a person wishes to join the body, his first duty is to make a full confession to an elder of the same sex with himself. It would seem that this confession is renewed afterward from time to time; for one of the elders, cited by Mr. Nordhoff, says that it "often takes years for individuals to complete this work of thorough confession and repentance;" to which he adds that, "upon this, more than upon aught else, depends their success as permanent and happy members." The effect of such a confession, made to God in the presence "of one of his true witnesses," can bring, they justly think, upon the person making the confession, "a more awful sense of his accountability both to God and to man than all his confessions in darkness had ever done."

The candidate for membership brings his property with him, which is held in trust by the community. The use of it goes to the body, and he is maintained, without wages of labor or receipt of interest. When he enters the body he gives up all claim upon his property forever. If this

be so, the complaint of Brown, which has been mentioned, is entirely without foundation.

The community of goods is connected with a common life of great plainness, and of obligation to work under the authorized foreman. The habits of all the Shaker bodies are exceedingly neat and frugal. This, with their industry, directed by experience to profitable objects, has made them thriving and even wealthy.

Their worship on Sunday consists of singing a hymn, addresses by a male and a female elder, with a kind of shuffling dance, in which all participate. Sometimes silent prayer is called for by an elder. Sometimes the prayers of the assembly are requested by some person in distress of mind. Sometimes a person sets up a whirl or circular dance which continues for a considerable time. Their meetings in their public or family hall are partly religious and partly social.

For many particulars of their social life, for their intercourse with spirits, for their family police and the care taken to prevent anything which would cause scandal, we must refer to Mr. Nordhoff's volume, one-quarter of which is devoted to this form of communistic life. Springing out of the Society of Friends, they have inherited some of the mystical and spiritual elements of the latter, together with their tendency to quietude and to rationalism. Their community of goods is apparently derived from that of the

Pentecostal Church ; their speaking with tongues is but a repetition of that recorded in the Book of Acts and the First Epistle to the Corinthians—or, rather, a copy of an original about which they know little ; their confession is suggested by the confession recommended in the Epistle of James ; their dances, perhaps, point back to David and Miriam. In some things they bear a resemblance to the Essenes and the Therapeutæ : thus, in filling up their numbers by means of adopted children, they are like the former ; in their dances, like the latter ; in their being a celibatary union, like both ; and in the living of the sexes together, again like the latter. We may add that, like the Therapeutæ, they lead a life free from ascertained scandal. In shrewdness, economy, and practical management, they are surpassed by communities on no other basis.

V.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES CONCLUDED.

In the present article our aim will be to take a brief view of several other of the modern communities which have established themselves in the United States, and to lay down some general conclusions respecting this class of societies. The oldest of these was founded by George Rapp, a peasant from Würtemberg, who, to escape perse-

cution from the clergy, on account of his unlicensed preaching, led a colony of like-minded persons across the Atlantic, and settled first, in 1805, in Butler County, Pennsylvania; then, in 1814, on the Wabash, in Indiana; and, finally, turning his face eastward again, erected a new village on the Ohio, near Pittsburgh. The first two abodes were called Harmony; that in Indiana he sold to Robert Owen, and named his last dwelling-place Economy. About 1832 there was a split among Rapp's followers, headed by a worthless adventurer from Germany. The disaffected portion withdrew, and planted another colony in the neighborhood, which ere long wasted away. Rapp, who died in 1847, was the spiritual head, while his son took charge of temporal affairs. After the son's death, the community gave both spiritual and temporal supervision into the old man's hand, who associated with himself in the latter charge two of the society in whom he could trust.

The property was regarded as common stock at an early date; but in 1818 it was made such by a common agreement, with the provision that, if a member died or withdrew from the society, nothing could be claimed on his or his heirs' account as a matter of right.

In the early times of the settlement the members were free to marry; but after a religious revival in 1807 they decided to institute celibacy, a

decision which led a number of young persons to leave the society. George Rapp, according to Mr. Nordhoff, neither urged nor opposed this important step, yet "gave it as his opinion that the unmarried is the higher and holier state." This opinion is consonant with another—that God and the first man both had a dual nature, and that, but for the Fall, new beings would have come into the world without being born of woman. The coming of Christ and a new world they hold to be close at hand. The wicked are to be ultimately redeemed.

Like the Shakers, they require of neophytes a full confession of sins to one of the elders. Their principal act of worship is an annual Lord's Supper, in October.

The community has been prosperous, and their property, which in 1854 was worth a million of dollars, is now considerably larger. Yet their numbers—one hundred and ten elderly persons; besides thirty or forty adopted children—forebode their decline, and the community must soon disappear. None of the communities in this country have had a more estimable founder.

The Separatists of Zoar, in Tuscarawas, Ohio, like the Rappites, were led by persecutions in Würtemberg to emigrate (in 1817) to the United States, and, being aided by Quakers, purchased the land where they now dwell. They soon came to the conclusion that, if they would succeed,

they must have a community of goods. "As soon as we adopted community of goods," said one of the older members to Mr. Nordhoff, "we began to prosper." They are now worth more than a million of dollars; but their number, which was two hundred and fifty in 1819, is now not more than three hundred.

They allow the marriage of their members; but to Mr. Nordhoff's inquiry "whether they favored it," the reply was, "that it was, on the whole, unfavorable to community life." Their leader, although a married man himself, taught that "God did not look with pleasure on marriage, but only tolerated it;" that in the kingdom of heaven "husband, wife, and children will not know each other. There will be no distinction of sex there." The remarkable fact recorded by Mr. Nordhoff, that when children had reached the age of three, they were separated from their parents, and brought up, girls and boys apart, under the care of persons specially appointed for that purpose, shows a feeling that family life is inconsistent with communal life. This practice, however, was abandoned in 1845.

The Zoarites in their creed are orthodox Christians as to the Trinity, the Fall, salvation through Christ, and the authority of the Scriptures; but they discard both baptism and the Lord's Supper. A candidate for admission into their community must pass through a probation;

and, when received into membership, must, as in other similar societies, place his property under the community's exclusive control. Like the Rappites, at Economy, the Zoarites have declined considerably in numbers during the era of their greatest prosperity. Owing, perhaps, to their principal leaders, they are found to be inferior in intelligence and refinement to the other communities.

The Inspirationists emigrated in 1842 from South Germany, to a place near Buffalo, which in 1855 they sold, without loss, and removed by degrees to a place in Iowa, which they call Amana, a few miles to the west of Iowa City and on the river of the same name. Here they have seven villages, and, when Mr. Nordhoff visited them, they counted 1,450 members and owned 25,000 acres of land. They were united in Germany as a religious body; but formed their communal system after reaching the United States. Having a considerable amount of property among them when they left Europe, they seem to have been more prosperous from the first than most of the other German communities. To their community of goods, adopted, as they think, by inspiration, they attribute their ability to hold together. They allow marriage; but regard it as a meritorious act to remain single. Their temporal affairs are managed by thirteen male trustees. Their religious leader may be of either sex. They

are orthodox Christians in most respects ; but reject the endless punishment of the wicked. The Lord's Supper is celebrated whenever the inspired leaders direct. The admission of candidates for membership is on much the same plan as in the other communities of which we have spoken. It differs from some of them in this respect: that when the person admitted leaves the society the property given up by him is returned, although without interest. On the whole, these communists of Amana seem to be as prosperous as any others in the United States. Their bond of union is the Inspired Guide ; and whenever this part of the system gives way, before increasing intelligence, the whole system—which in its spirit is more like an ordinary colony of homogeneous persons than most others—must be expected to fall to pieces.

There is yet another communistic system, of which I would fain say nothing, because decency forbids saying much. This is the system of the Perfectionists at Oneida and Wallingford, which bodies consist of people above the average intelligence of the Shakers and the German communists in the United States, and have been thus far shrewd and prosperous in their business transactions. Of their faith and practice I will give a faint idea in two quotations from the "History of American Socialisms," by Mr. Noyes, their founder (1876).

“Admitting,” he says, page 625, “that the community principle of the Day of Pentecost, in its actual operation at that time, extended only to material goods, yet we affirm that there is no intrinsic difference between property in person and property in things; and that the same spirit, which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money, would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, exclusiveness in regard to women and children.” And again, while criticising Fourier, he says (p. 630): “Holiness, free love, association in labor, and immortality constitute the chain of redemption and must come together in their true order.” “It is evident that any attempt to revolutionize sexual morality before settlement with God is out of order. Holiness must go before free love” (p. 631).

Such opinions are daily acted on and freely avowed. Mr. Nordhoff was permitted to be present at a Sunday afternoon “criticism,” as they call it, which he describes at some length. At the end the head of the community spoke. “Concerning the closing remarks of Noyes,” says he (p. 293), “which disclose so strange and horrible a view of morals and duty, I need say nothing.” And we have said enough. [Comp. Appendix I.]

We are now prepared to lay down certain conclusions touching communal societies as they present themselves to us in modern times. In doing this, we are aware of the danger of hasty general-

izations, and, of course, feel that they may be drawn into question; but the history of such institutions has tested them on so many sides that we have some confidence in the justness of our results.

1. In the first place, then, it is shown that, with equally good management, a community offers a somewhat cheaper mode of living than that which families adopt in separate houses. Fourier was not wrong in claiming that his phalansteries would furnish lodgings for the poor at a smaller price than separate hovels would; and in all the expenses for food and other necessities a greater economy is possible. But this economy is possible, not only because thirty rooms within four walls are less costly than five houses, each with six rooms of like quality; or because cooking, washing, heating on the large scale are less expensive than on the small; but because, and principally because, in the community persons can live as they will, beyond the influence, perceived or unperceived, of a general social opinion. Simplicity can be aimed at in all the parts of life; luxuries may be cut off which are accessible outside of the common village and its neighborhood.

2. Again, the union of family life and communal life is not fitted to make the community system flourish. The two are different and to an extent hostile principles. The family must draw off the interests of its members from the larger

body which encloses it, and concentrate them on itself. If the family has a share in the common property, that may be a motive for existing families to remain in it; but every new family would inquire, "Why should we join the society, when we have our own unity to bind us together and a plenty of persons in the world whom we know and love?" The family implies a sort of privacy and seclusion from the world, without separation; the community implies separation from the world, and a new unity inconsistent with or controlling the smaller or family union. In some of the communities spoken of above it was found that they began to thrive when they adopted the celibate principle. Groups of families, then, united by some communal bond, are not likely to be successful if such an experiment should be tried.

3. It follows that the more such communities are separated from the world by their mode of life or principles, the more probable will be their permanence. This is only saying that something permanent in its own nature, some common faith especially, if it has drawn them together, will be likely to keep them together. It is true that, if they begin, after the community is established, to speculate and doubt, there will be divisions among them, as there may be other causes of divisions, from cliques and parties. But divisions from the former cause will be less natural than if they held their opinions in the midst of the world; for they

have now escaped from a strong opposing sentiment, from ridicule and social ostracism.

4. Religious reasons for founding communal establishments are more likely to insure success than others. Here we mean by *religious reasons* any held in common touching the relations of man to God and to the end of living, whether they include objectionable features or not. If such objectionable features belong to the community, they will naturally act against it, both within and in the opinion of an outside society, which condemns or even abhors its creed or practices. And to some extent this must weaken, if it do not soon destroy, the settlement. But religion, seriously entertained, for which men have sacrificed something, is a very strong bond of union. It ties a small community together and keeps them apart from the rest of the world. It may make them even dread the world. It cannot be an accident that Cabet's and Robert Owen's societies, with no religion, have had a poor success and a short life; while ignorant Germans, as spiritual guides, led colonies adopting a common life into this land, which have had a very far greater amount of prosperity.

5. It would seem that communities consisting of well-educated and cultivated persons have no assurance of success. The motive to undertake a new manner of life is wanting. They lead such a life already, and have such friends and sources of

enjoyment, as they desire. Why should they wish to change? Moreover, they are more individual and independent than others of an inferior grade. Why should they give up their freedom?

We can conceive of a group of families, with the highest religious character and cultivation, as being disgusted with the corruptions of the society around them, and as seeking their escape in local separation and in closer union with one another. But, not to dwell on the fact that they could hardly do this without being untrue to religious principle, they would probably feel it easier and safer to withdraw in some degree from the society around them than to take such a revolutionary step in life.

Communities will consist hereafter, then, as they have done, chiefly of persons in humble life; of those whose minds are uneasy and out of joint; and of such as have found no place of rest in the general society of the world.

6. As for health and prosperity in their undertakings, communities on the best footing have much to say for themselves. Several that began poor have risen into great prosperity. It may be said, indeed, that lands have been purchased for them in this country which would have cost twenty times as much at home, and that some of them have run backward, almost into bankruptcy; but, apart from this, the economy of living which we have spoken of and an orderly arrangement of

work, under shrewd supervisors, with abstinence from hurtful drinks, must have placed them above the same number of persons arranged in families. If, for instance, a community consisted of five hundred persons, a number equal to about that of a hundred families; it would probably save more at the end of the year than those families would, supposing them engaged in the same industries. And, while a number of these families would be injured or ruined by the vice of the father, the community would be less likely to be harmed by the misconduct of the superintendent and the carelessness of the foreman. Yet it must be taken into consideration that the number of active laborers in the community of five hundred would be much greater than in the one hundred families. But, at all events, it is probable that the savings of an equal amount of hours' work in the community would be greater. And, with equal endeavors on the part of the communities to secure health, these endeavors would be, it is probable, attended with more success.

7. Of course, in the communities, where they are strictly such, the family affections—one essential means by which man rises above the brute, and religion with all human improvement finds a home in the world—are nearly undeveloped.

8. If we could conceive of a group of communistic societies pervading a country, on the supposition that they were merely voluntary and only

protected by the state, as private families are now, the system would tend to break up general society; and this would happen, even if there were a brotherhood maintained between these communities, as far as could be possible. Society would lose many of those fibres of connection which run across it now in every direction, and much of the life and enterprise which now exist. As family life would then need to develop itself within and under community life, much of its power would be lost. The interest felt in the affairs of the body politic would probably be in a considerable degree diminished. The nation would be reduced into the smaller component parts, and the general administration of law be made difficult. Whether the national power itself could with success take the place of control and close superintendence over these communities; whether by a constitution and general laws a state could successfully organize society on a community plan, is an interesting question, which will need our attention when we come to look at the most modern socialism and the socialized state. But we must regard a wide communistic system upon a *voluntary* basis as certain to fail.

APPENDIX I.—No. 1.

A few weeks before this work went into the press, Mr. J. H. Noyes, the founder of the Oneida and Wallingford communities, and the author of the history of American socialism to which we have referred in this work, proposed to the Oneida community the following articles, which have been adopted as a basis of a new system.

“I propose :

“1. That we give up the practice of complex marriage, not as renouncing belief in the principles and prospective finality of that institution ; but in deference to the public sentiment which is evidently rising against it.

“2. That we place ourselves not on the platform of the Shakers, on the one hand, nor of the world, on the other ; but on Paul’s platform, which allows marriage, but prefers celibacy.

“To carry out this change, it will be necessary, first of all, that we should go into a new and earnest study of the 7th chapter of 1 Corinthians, in which Paul fully defines his position, and also that of the Lord Jesus Christ, in regard to the sexual relations proper for the church, in the presence of worldly institutions.

“If you accept these modifications, the community will consist of two distinct classes—the

married and the celibates—both legitimate; but the last preferred.

“What will remain of our communism after these modifications may be defined thus:

“1. We shall hold our property and businesses in common, as now.

“2. We shall live together in a common household and eat at a common table, as now.

“3. We shall have a common children’s department, as now.

“4. We shall have our daily evening meetings and all of our present means of moral and spiritual improvement.”

Thus the immoral and most objectionable features of these communities being removed—for it can hardly be questioned that the associated community of Wallingford will concur in the proposed changes—they will be placed on the same, or nearly the same, basis with the most religious and successful of the American communities, such as those of Zoar and of Amana.

How far this great change has been owing to a feeling within the community, where, as it would seem, the younger members have not all been satisfied with the most obnoxious feature of the system; and how far it has been forced on the members by a very decided opinion outside, which even called on the civil authority to interfere in the matter, we cannot positively say. The change is a cheering and hopeful one, as showing

that no society can have long continuance in this country, however successful in its industrial affairs, which is, and is generally held to be, opposed to social morality.

APPENDIX I.—No. 2.

In 1878 appeared a small work, entitled "American Communists," by William Alfred Hinds, a member of the Oneida community, and an editor, I believe, of the *American Socialist*. It contains the results of personal observations, and as the author is an educated man, having received the degree of Ph.B., in the Sheffield School of Yale College (1870), and writes candidly, his work deserves confidence. I have to acknowledge the receipt of a copy from the intelligent, fair-minded author.

We have room for only a few additions to what we have said respecting some of these communities, and for a short notice of one of them not mentioned before.

1. The Harmonists of Economy, Beaver Co., Pa., are still flourishing in a high degree, as to their business affairs, but are dwindling in their numbers. "The thousand members are reduced to one hundred, and of these but few are under sixty" (p. 7). "The young people, on reaching

maturity, are allowed to decide between becoming full members of the society (provided of course they are of suitable character), or going outside, or remaining and working for wages; and more prefer the latter alternative than the former, though required in such case to conform to the customs of the society, even in respect to celibacy; but the greater number prefer a life of complete independence, with all its drawbacks, to the restraints of communism." (pp. 19-20).

It seems possible that this community must become extinct in the course of a generation, or change its constitution in some important respects.

2. The Zoarites, or Separatists of Zoar, Tuscarawas County, Ohio, are still wealthy and prosperous; they own 7,200 acres of land, with various mills and other property, all of which they estimate to be worth \$731,000. Their number is now reduced from five hundred to two hundred and fifty, although marriage is freely allowed, and generally exists among them. This diminution comes from the unwillingness of the young people to live in the community, and seems to show that marriage in a highly flourishing community cannot keep up its numbers. "There are one hundred and seventy-five persons who subsist on wages paid by the community." To the inquiry what the effect, on the body, was of employing so many hirelings, they answered: "Very

injurious. They tempt our people into bad habits. We commenced hiring about 1834, after the cholera had swept off about one-third of our old members." Few of the older members quit the community, but new members frequently leave, and many of the young folks leave as they become of age" (pp. 28-31).

The Zoarites are orthodox Christians, averse to all ceremony in worship, and under a constitution which provides sufficiently for their welfare. Why, then, do they not thrive more in respect to their numbers? The reasons seem to be, first, that the community feeling is not sufficiently strong; as is shown by the fact that the children leave the society more or less, and that new members, instead of signing the covenant and becoming members in full, with a right to vote and be elected trustees or into the standing committee, choose to stay in the lower class, where, if dissatisfied, they may withdraw with their property paid back to them. In short, the outside world is too little separated from the community to induce novices and the young to enter into a full and final union; and the spirit of the outside world is brought into the body by new adherents, and by hired men. Habits have changed since the times succeeding the foundation. Then "all the persons and families in one house did their work together." "Now each family" (*i. e.*, the inhabitants of one house, as I understand it) "attends to all its affairs, its

cooking, washing, etc., separately." This again reveals a tendency towards family life, rather than towards community life. Again, "for fifteen years after the Zoarites began to marry (p. 32), it was a rule that children should be taken care of by the society, from the time they were three years old, and they were for this purpose placed under superintendents appointed by the community." The older members regret this, which is evidently a movement towards family life (pp. 31, 32, 33).

The Amana community of Inspirationists was found by Mr. Hinds to be in a very flourishing condition, both as it respects numbers and wealth; their members being 1,600, their lands amounting to from 25,000 to 30,000 acres, and their manufacturing industries being quite prosperous. They live, as we have seen, in seven villages situated in Iowa Co., Iowa, which are near enough one to another to preserve the entire unity of superintendence and common feeling. There are five hundred children under sixteen years of age, and more than two hundred aged persons, in the villages. "Marriage is tolerated, but it is deemed best to remain single, as St. Paul advises. Formerly marriage was looked on with a more unfriendly eye than at present; but a young man now may not marry until he is twenty-four, and he must wait a year after he has announced his intention, before he can lead his betrothed to the altar.

By marriage, the standing of the parties in the society suffers for a time. If a man marries out of the society, he is excluded for a while, even though his wife might choose to become a member. At table, church, and labor the sexes are separated" (p. 53).

This community is sincerely religious in the servile way of following the letter of the Scriptures. Thus they believe in the prophetic inspiration which has fallen on two members of the community, Christian Metz, a carpenter, and Barbara Heynemann, an ignorant servant-girl, who, since 1867, has had the prophetic office alone, and is consulted by the trustees in important affairs. It was by inspiration, they say, that they were led to adopt community of goods after their emigration to this continent.

The most interesting question for our object, is, What has been the cause of the prosperity of these people? Several causes may be alleged as having combined to produce this effect. One is that the community is separated by its German origin and adherence to the German language from the outside world. Another is that the new members seem to be supplied chiefly from within or by accessions of persons, few at a time, from Germany. Another is the strict religiousness and practical morality of members. "There is some religious expression before and after every meal; there is a meeting for prayer every evening;

there are meetings on Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday mornings. Sometimes they all meet in church; sometimes in smaller apartments and in order. For the members are divided into three classes: the first including the elders and the most earnest and spiritual; the second, those who have made considerable progress in conforming to the highest standard; and the third, the children, new members, back-sliders, and others" (p. 53). But besides these reasons, we incline to think that the sombreness and want of intellectual life of the community must be attractive chiefly to those who have no great interest in the movements of the outside world.

Mr. Hinds thinks that they fail to realize the blessings which belong to communism, by not sufficiently concentrating their dwellings and labor. Every village ought to have, he thinks, a few large houses, where a single kitchen and dining-room would save labor and expense; so also to have a common butter and cheese factory, instead of each eating-house making these products of the dairy by hand, as well as a common laundry with the requisite apparatus. Yet the building of a common laundry is in contemplation. He adds, that "each village ought to have a large library and eating-room, but there is nothing of the kind. They have preserved from the first the utterances of the prophets, and printed them in more than a hundred volumes" (pp. 53, 54).

Mr. Hinds (pp. 152-161) gives an account, chiefly in the language of the founder, of the "Brotherhood of the New Life," which has two principal centres, one at Salem-on-Erie, in the town of Portland, N. Y., and the other in Fountain Grove, Santa Rosa, California, where Thomas L. Harris, the originator of the plan of life, resides. He was a Universalist preacher, then a Spiritualist "and a leader of Christian against infidel Spiritualism," then one of the leaders of the Mountain Cave Community, a spiritualistic society; and has led and acted in several other places. "The Brotherhood," says Mr. Hinds, "claim to have *evoluted* out of communism, but at one time held their property in common, and still carry it on together, and possess many other communistic features, both in theory and in practice" (p. 142). Mr. Harris says: "Personally I am not a communist. I find it impossible to maintain the ordinary relations, much more to unite in close association communistically with my nearest friends. My home is practically an hermitage: the evolution of my faculties has led me into strict natural celibacy" (p. 142).

Mr. Harris again says: "I find no difficulty in the solution of the painful and perplexing problem of the sexes. Monogamists who enter into union with me, rise, by changes of life, into a desire for the death of natural sexuality. Those whose lives have been less strict at first,

perhaps, may pass through the monogamic relation, though not always; but the end is the same. Still I do not believe that sexlessness characterizes man in his higher and final evolution" (p. 146).

And again he says: "Among my people, as they enter into the peculiar evolution that constitutes the new life, two things decrease: the propagation of the species, and physical death. One young pair in our borders have had three children, I am sorry to say; but, with this exception, the births in seventeen years have been but two; and of these, the younger is almost a young man. We think that generation must cease till the sons and daughters of God are prepared for the higher generation by evolution into structural bi-sexual completeness above the plane of sin, of disease, or of natural mortality" (ibid.).

"I have considered my family," he adds, "since 1861, merely as a school: its methods educational, and its form only tentative. My aim, *per se*, has been neither to organize close nor far apart association, but to prepare myself and the inmates of my house for *a new era of human evolution*, which we have considered to be at hand, and which, in individual cases, we think has now begun. We think that, by the survival of the fittest, the most plastic, the most complex organisms—men of a new spirit wrought bodily into new structures—the race will take a new depar-

ture ; that we approach a new beginning of human days and generations " (p. 147).

In a letter of an earlier date (1873), from which Mr. Hinds makes extracts, Mr. Harris is much more on the Christian foundation. "The one object of the Brotherhood," says he, "is the realization of the noble Christian ideal in social service. It is simply an effort to demonstrate that the ethical creed of the Gospel is susceptible of service as a working system," etc. "In one sense the Brotherhood are Spiritualists" (p. 149). "In another sense they are socialists" (p. 150).

After all this theosophico-Darwinian stuff, we fail to find out anything tangible and practical respecting this brotherhood's aims and doctrines. As for the family at Salem-on-Erie, which is exceedingly reticent and unwilling to gratify curiosity (See Hinds, p. 151), we learn (p. 149) that "their hotel and store were closed, their railway restaurant was burnt, and neither their vine-culture nor other business in a very flourishing condition. Some of the estate had been sold, and the impression was that they would gladly dispose of more." Part of the family had followed their leader to California, and others, it was thought, would follow. The family at Fountain Grove numbers at present about twenty persons (p. 151).

They have adopted the notion, entertained by some of the other communities, that "the crea-

tive Logos"—God manifest in the flesh—is not male merely or female merely, but the two-in-one (Harris in Hinds, p. 147). They have recently published two pamphlets, entitled, "The Lord, the Two-in-One," and "Hymns of the Two-in-One" (p. 151).

CHAPTER III.

COMMUNISTIC THEORIES AND UTOPIAS.

I.

PLATO—SIR THOMAS MORE—CAMPANELLA.

THE communities hitherto noticed had at their foundation no direct purpose of acting upon general society or upon the state. Their object, rather, was to keep away from their members the influences of the outside world as far as possible, and in all liberty to develop their own social and religious views. To society, as at the time constituted, they entertained no such hatred as the most modern socialists feel. They thought only that they had reached a better form of society, yet one which it would not be possible for all men to adopt; one that all men would not willingly adopt. Their plans thus ended in a great degree with themselves and with separation from the rest of mankind.

But might not principles similar to theirs, in some respects, be carried out upon a larger scale and by the state itself? In every old society

there have been and must perhaps always be evils, growing out of institutions as old and as much revered as the state. There is, especially in a society which is growing corrupt in consequence of its prosperity, and which is advanced enough in reflection to think upon the causes of social evils, a tendency to search for some cure of these evils, which lies beyond the reach of individuals and can only be applied by the highest authority. And it is not strange that inexperienced, speculative thinkers, who saw how much evil arose from private property, from family life, from the unrestricted action of the individual, should seek for a cure of such evil in a complete transformation of society. Men are not just. The city or the state is not a unity, but is split up by factions and strifes of classes. How can such evils be removed save by the state itself, the only power sufficient for the undertaking? Such questions would be asked not so much by men of an ordinary stamp as by those who had strong moral sensibilities and a high ideal of the ends aimed at by life in the world. If such men had a practical spirit and any hope of success, they would become reformers. If they were of another sort, they would construct Utopias.

Plato has left in his "Republic" an image of a state which is intended to set forth the reign of justice in a community. Whether it was to him a mere Utopia, or whether it was something more,

has been long made a question. His scholar, Aristotle, treats his means for attaining to the great end of political justice, as if they were to be realized in an actual state. On the other hand, in his "Book of Laws" there is another republic contemplated—one in which the ordinary relations of society are to be protected and defended; in which, on the existing basis, society is to be made as just, pure, and reverential, as laws and institutions can make it. Taking the two works together, we must either say that Plato regarded the picture of a just state which appears in his "Republic" as a mere illustration of the same harmonious action which can be traced in the just individual; or we must say that he regarded his institutions in the "Republic" as desirable in themselves, and saw nothing immoral in them, so long as they conduced to the common good, to the unity and exemption from selfishness in the classes of which his "Republic" consists. That this last explanation is the true one appears from a passage in the "Laws," where he says that the first or best state and the best laws would be found where "nothing existed that is separate and not common; where wives were common and children and everything that could be used." "Such a state, whether gods or children of gods inhabited it, would be a happy abode." But the state which he is treating of would be next in its immortality, and the first in a second class. So, then, to some degree we

must make the genial philosopher responsible, and deserving of Aristotle's severe rebukes.

The state, however, in the "Republic" is not worked out in all its features. The classes are three in number—the rulers, the guards, and the workingmen or artificers and cultivators; answering to the *reason*, the *soul as the seat of courage* and feeling, and to *desire* or the desires. And, as the regular action of each of these departments of the spiritual being insures right conduct or justice, so the right action, unity, and justice of the state is preserved by the orders of society, each fulfilling its part. But Plato, in developing his subject, says very little in regard to the first and the third class. The former would, of course, be small; and its recruits were to be taken from the most trusty among the guards. The third class may, for aught that appears, own property, live in families, and be like the same class in other commonwealths; and if among their children some should show conspicuous ability, they are to be transferred to the class of guards; as also, if there are children of the guards who fall below the qualities proper for that class, they are to be thrust down into the third class, for we sometimes find, says Plato, that a golden father has an iron son.

The guards themselves, whose especial office it is to protect the state from foreign enemies and from domestic seditions, are to have no houses,

nor lands, nor anything which they can call their own. The women who are selected to continue the race of the guards are to be wives of no one in particular, but of the whole class; and care is to be taken by the rulers that, when children are born to this or that woman, no one of the guards shall be able to say, This child is mine. All the children belong to all; and thus separate and exclusive relations to wives and children, the causes of disunion in a state, are to be obliterated.

The criticisms of Aristotle on this kind of polity show not only how Plato failed to gain his end; how he would destroy the state by removing differences; and how that in which the greatest numbers share receives the least care from each; but also how abhorrent this scheme was to the Greek mind. That such changes in society could be seriously proposed is to be accounted for by the prevailing Greek view, that the state had nearly unrestricted power; that it was the sovereign, which held the fortunes and destinies of the citizens in its hands. That they had little chance of being accepted may be gathered from the ridicule which they met with from the leading comic poet of Athens.

The "Republic" of Plato may have suggested the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, written in Latin, and first published in or earlier than the year 1516, in the first part of the reign of Henry VIII. and before the author had come into political im-

portance. It is, perhaps, to be regarded as a mere dream; for, at the close of the work, it is said by one of the interlocutors: "If, on the first hand, I cannot adhere to all that has been said by Hythlodæus [the discoverer of the Island of Utopia]; on the other, I readily confess that there are among the Utopians many things which I could wish to see established in our cities. I wish this more than I hope for it." The name Utopia, also, meaning *no place*, seems to point at something outside of the real world, to the imaginary seat of an imaginary republic. Some of his sentiments were either mere fancies or were belied by his conduct afterward. Thus all religions are equally tolerated and equally bound to tolerate one another. Pure deism is the predominant faith; but those who deny the being of God or the immortality of the soul are incapacitated for holding office. This book was printed but a year or so before the first outbreak of the Reformation; yet its author, when he became chancellor, fourteen years afterward, consented to measures of severity against the Protestants.

The Utopia opens with a sad account of the social state of England, which is attributable to the number of non-producers, to the rich who take from the poor, to the idle who prevent the industrious from prospering. To this the speaker who had discovered Utopia replies, that in all states where individual property exists, where

everything is measured by money, justice can never reign nor secure the public prosperity. In order to establish a just balance in human affairs, property must be abolished. As long as this right of property lasts, the largest and best class can only bear the burden of unrest, misery, and sorrow. Palliatives for this evil may be found—such as laws fixing a maximum of possessions in land or money; but they cannot remove the evil so long as individual property exists. The sole remedy is community of goods, such as prevails in Utopia.

In this island, separated from the main-land by an artificial channel, there is a capital, with fifty-four other towns, all built on the same plan and calculated for 6,000 families, with many large farm-houses scattered through the country, and able, each, to accommodate at least forty persons. All the inhabitants must work on the farm or in some branch of industry; and, as no one can be idle, a day's work consisting of six hours will suffice for all the wants of the island. Then the rest of the day may be devoted to study in the public colleges, and the evening to recreation.

In the island markets for provisions are established, and public magazines for manufactures. Every head of a family finds there, without cost, all necessary articles. Meals are taken in common. There are also common hospitals and common nurseries, where mothers may nurse their

children. Marriage is the law and usage of the land; but the number of children in separate dwellings is equalized, by taking away the excess from one family, and placing them in another.

Money is unknown among the Utopians except as an aid to external intercourse. Nor is traveling into the interior allowed, except by permission of the magistrates; in which case the traveler pays for the conveyance and provisions furnished to him by laboring wherever he stops.

The government is simple. Every thirty families choose a magistrate; every ten of these divisions, a superior magistrate; and a prince is elected by the inferior magistrates out of four candidates proposed by the people. Every town sends three deputies to a legislature, invested with legislative powers and sitting at the capital. The magistrates have it for their principal office to keep people at work. But would the system encourage work or idleness? This important inquiry is proposed in the course of the dialogue, but meets with no sufficient answer.

I have mentioned some of the details of More's plan, because the socialists of the more modern times have seen the same difficulties, and proposed some of the same expedients for their removal. The Utopia may be regarded as written long before the era when social changes were called for with a loud voice, yet as foreseeing the course which such changes would take.

Another ideal reformer, more according to Plato's pattern, Thomas Campanella, flourished about a century after More; his "City of the Sun" having been first published in 1623. This man, a learned philosopher of Italy and a Dominican monk, incurred the jealousy of the Spaniards, and was sentenced, after being put seven times to the rack, to perpetual imprisonment; but was liberated after some twenty-six years of confinement, and spent the end of his life in France. There is little in his communistic scheme that is worthy of notice, and it has had little influence on the minds of men disposed to speculate in that direction. In fact, it has been rescued from oblivion only in comparatively recent times. As another has remarked: "The monastery is the type of the social organization which he extols; the pontifical power and the ecclesiastical hierarchy serve as the basis of the government of his new society." The two main points of his system are community of property and of wives, and a government lodged in the hands of philosophers; in both of which he follows Plato. In regard to the first, he perceives the connection between the abolition of private property and the abolition of the family. He says, in a passage which I borrow from another, that "the spirit of property increases among us only because we have each a house, a wife, and children of our own. Thence comes selfishness, for, in

order to raise a son to honors and riches and to make him heir of a great fortune, we dilapidate the public treasure, if we can control others by our wealth and power; or, if we are feeble, poor, and of an obscure family, we become avaricious, perfidious, hypocrites." And, in carrying out this kind of community, he follows Plato in endeavoring to improve the breed of men by measures of government, expressing his astonishment that races of animals should receive attention in this respect, while the race of men is neglected.

Campanella carries his dread of property even beyond the points above spoken of. No one has a fixed abode. Every six months the magistrates determine the district or circle, the house and chamber, which each one is to occupy; apparently, lest there should be any local attachments, any home feeling. All the mechanic arts are common to both sexes. All products are distributed by the magistrates in proportion to each one's needs. As for the amount of these needs, since the inhabitants all take a vow of frugality and poverty, and it is assumed by Campanella that four hours' work daily will be adequate for their supply, they cannot be very great.

The magistrates in this republic are all to be philosophers, according to Plato's noted words, in the "Republic," that until kings become philosophers, or philosophers become kings, there can be no end of evils in political communities. The su-

preme magistrate is the most eminent philosopher in the City of the Sun, and has the title of the Sun, or the great metaphysician. Under him three magistrates—answering to the three attributes of power, wisdom, and love in the individual man—preside respectively over war, over science, and over industry and the arts. Under these, and chosen by them, there is a great body of officers, distinguished for some kind of knowledge, and chosen by the great metaphysician and his three ministers. They are invested with very great executive powers, with which the religious authority also, even that of holding auricular confession, is united. Thus a thorough despotism, the only government possible in a communistic society, if it can subsist, is established.

Why he should want a religious autocrat for his Utopia we can explain; but his union of the two powers, so contrary to Catholic doctrine, his doctrine of marriage, so un-Christian, and the modicum of freedom provided for his republic, when he suffered so much from despotism himself, make him a rare specimen in the history of philosophers.

II

COMMUNISTIC THEORIES IN FRANCE—MABLY—MORELLY—
BABŒUF'S CONSPIRACY.

The middle of the last century was the time when socialism, only a dream or the animating spirit of a small, secluded society before, began to proclaim itself to the world as the true and just foundation of communities made up of living men. It was in France that words sought first to become deeds; that inexperience and mere theory ventured on experiments which were of value to the world, but ruinous to those who made them.

Why France took the lead in the new movements of thought which mark the last century, and why these movements ended in the most memorable of revolutions are questions which we must pass by. Here we can only say that bold, inexperienced thought, misgovernment, feebleness of the executive, and great corruption in society came into the field of action together. In bringing about the result, theories of society and of personal rights had as much weight in the scale as any other of the concurring causes.

The socialistic tendencies of this age cannot, I think, be laid principally at Rousseau's door. As I understand his views in the "social contract," the individual in a state of nature makes an absolute surrender of what he has and of himself in

order to form the political body. Because all do it alike, complete equality and reciprocity reign in the community. But before the surrender each had his own goods, and thus property was not the creation of the state. Rousseau, then, was no communist in the strictest sense; but the notion of equality might easily be perverted so as to mean equality of possessions, and the entire surrender of the individual, with no restrictions on the action of the state, would, of course, involve the possibility of any kind of absolutism; of one, for instance, under which private property would cease and community of goods be established. And this might easily be the course of a revolution such as that of France in the last century.

If Rousseau cannot be numbered among the communistic writers, strictly so called, two of his contemporaries, Mably and Morelly—the first more a dreamer, the second of a more practical spirit—deserve that title. Rousseau complained that Mably copied him, without shame or stint. But the case seems to be that Mably's principal opinions rest rather on Plato than on any modern predecessor. It also appears that Mably changed his views in the course of his literary life. In his earlier writings he shows a preference for arbitrary power. In his later ones, he has changed in most important respects; in fact, his theory of society has altered. And this was an honest change in his own mind; for, being of a distin-

guished family, employed in the government, with good prospects before him, he withdrew from public occupations, to lead the life of an author and a scholar. It is noteworthy that he was a brother of Condillac, although very much older.

In the social theory of Mably, inequality of condition is the great evil in the world. He says: "Since the time that we have been so unfortunate as to conceive of great landed estates and differences of condition; avarice, ambition, vanity, envy, jealousy take their place in our hearts, to lacerate us, to invade the government of states and to tyrannize over them. Establish community of goods, and then nothing is easier than to establish equality of conditions, and on this double foundation to secure the welfare of men."

He answers the objection that men will not work without a personal motive, by admitting that the desire of property inspires the spirit of and the taste for labor; but replies that in our corruption we know only the personal motive for industry, and so we conceive that nothing can supply its place. "The toil which is a burden to laborers would be only a delicious amusement if all men had a share in it."

Mably read history badly. He appeals to Sparta as happy in a community of goods. But if there ever was in Sparta an equal division of land between the first Doric conquerors, all this had

ceased before Aristotle's time; and, in fact, the system rested originally and always, on a multitude of Helots, who were public slaves, and on a mass of inhabitants below the grade of privileged citizens.

Mably was a theorist who shrunk back from the practical application of his own theories. The establishment of community of goods, and even of equality of fortunes, he dared not advocate. "The evil," he says, "is too inveterate for the hope of a cure." And so he advised half measures—agrarian laws fixing the maximum of landed estates, and sumptuary laws regulating expenses. Yet, with his great reading and acquaintance with history, he must have well known that sumptuary laws have been always ineffectual against the taste for extravagance and self-indulgence.

Morelly, whose principal works are a communistic poem, called "The Basiliade" (1753) and "The Code of Nature" (1755), is called by a French writer one of the most obscure authors of the last century. But he knew what he wanted, and had courage to tell it to others. His work seems to have lain unnoticed for some time and was ascribed to Diderot; but, when the time was ready for it, it had vastly more effect than all the learning and theory of Mably, who was a number of years after him in his authorship.

Morelly's power on subsequent opinion consists in his being the first to put dreams or theories

into a code ; from which shape it seemed easy to fanatical minds to carry it out into action. His starting-point is that men can be made good or evil by institutions. Private property, or avarice called out by it, is the source of all vice. "Hence, where no property existed there would appear none of its pernicious consequences." He meets the objection that personal interest is a most powerful motive to human action by asserting that "idleness is produced by arbitrary institutions, which give to some men a permanent state of repose, which is called prosperity or fortune, and leave for others labor and hardship. These distinctions have led the former into indolence and effeminacy, and have inspired the others with aversion and disgust toward forced duties."

His fundamental laws of human society are : *First.* That nothing in society shall belong separately or in proprietorship to any one, except those things that are in daily use, either for his wants, his pleasures, or his daily labor.

Second. That every citizen shall be a public man, sustained, maintained, and employed at the public expense.

Third. That every citizen, for his part, shall contribute to the benefit of the public, according to his strength, talents, and age. On this principle, his duties shall be adjusted according to distributive laws. The laws divide the people by families, tribes, cities, and provinces. In order

to avoid accumulation, they prohibit all sale and exchange; they require every citizen to till the land between the ages of twenty and twenty-five; they make marriage imperative as soon as a marriageable age is reached, and allow no man to live single until after the age of forty; they provide for a common education of all children, after the age of five, in great public schools; and require that superiors in the mechanic arts shall give instruction to those who are under them in morals and a kind of vague deism.

Rotation in office is the leading feature of Morelly's plan of government. Every family in turn gives a head to the tribe of which it is a part; every tribe, in its turn, appoints the magistrate of the tribe, and so of the cities. The heads of tribes, however, and of the whole state hold their offices for life.

The penal laws contain the article that whoever, of whatever rank, shall endeavor to introduce "detestable property" shall, after being convicted and judged by the supreme senate, be shut up for life, as a madman and an enemy of humanity, in a cavern built in the place for public burial. His name shall be left out of the register of the citizens; his children and family shall give up his name, and shall be separately incorporated in other tribes, cities, or provinces. As Alfred Sudre, to whom I have been much indebted in this paper, remarks: although labor is

to become so very agreeable after property ceases to exist, Morelly seems to think that this great enemy will still have some friends left.

The feeling that all men are equal led insensibly to the feeling that all inequalities must be eradicated out of society. In order to justify this feeling, property must be shown to be an artificial institution, which a righteous state, or even a spoliation of the weaker by the stronger, may abolish. In 1782, Brissot de Warville invented the phrase, used afterward by Proudhon, *Propriété c'est le vol*, and even justified the temporary unions of the sexes found among races of men nearest to brutes. Twelve years afterward a war against the rich began, and such measures as a maximum of property and the abolition of the right to make a will were agitated. But the right of property prevailed, and grew stronger after each new revolution. In 1796 the conspiracy of the Equals, or, as it is generally called, of Babœuf, was the final and desperate measure of a portion of those Jacobins who had been stripped by the fall of Robespierre (in 1794) of political power. It was the last hope of the extreme revolutionists, for men were getting tired of agitations and wanted rest.

This conspiracy seems to have been fomented by Jacobins in prison; and it is said that one of them, who was a believer in Morelly and had his work in his hands, expounded its doctrines to his

fellow-prisoner, Babœuf. When they were set at liberty by an amnesty law, there was a successful effort made to bring together the society or sect of the Equals; but it was found that they were not all of one mind. Babœuf was for thorough measures—for a community of goods and of labor, an equality of conditions and of comforts. Antonelli, who had been a member of the Legislative Assembly, was for laws restricting property by a maximum and for other half measures. He thought that extreme measures would only destroy, without rebuilding; but he finally yielded to the views and plans of his associates. There was a secret committee of the society of the Equals, as well as an open society. The latter excited the suspicion of the Directory, and an order was given to suspend its sessions in the Pantheon (or Church of St. Geneviève). The order was executed by Bonaparte, then general of the army of the interior, who dispersed the members and put a seal on the doors of the place of meeting. Next the Equals won over a body of the police into their measures; and, when this force was disbanded by the Directory, the Equals established a committee of public safety. The committee was successful in bringing as many as sixty of the party of the mountain into their ranks, and an insurrection was projected. Seventeen thousand fighting men were calculated upon by the conspirators as at their disposal. But an

officer of the army whom they had tried to bring into their plots denounced them to the Directory. The leading conspirators were arrested. Babœuf and Danté suffered death, and five others were banished. One of the most ferocious of the sect, Sylvain Maréchal, a fanatical atheist, who, according to Taine, "erected atheism into a compulsory dogma and a superior duty," had written a manifesto for the occasion, in which he says: "We wish real equality or death. The French Revolution is only the precursor of another, much greater, more solemn, and the final one. Let all the arts perish, if need be, provided real equality remains for us." He disclaims the *maximum*, or agrarian laws, as being the project of some soldiers without principle, and of bodies of people without reason, and then adds: "We aim at something more sublime and more equitable—the common good, or the community of goods. No more individual property in lands. The land belongs to no person. We demand, we seek the common enjoyment of the fruits of the soil. The fruits are for all the world."

Buonarotti, an Italian, who belonged to the insurrectional committee above spoken of, published in 1828, after long years of exile, a project of an economical decree, so called, which reveals the special plans of the Equals for the new organization of France which they had in view. Some of the provisions of this project are that all prop-

erty of living persons, when they die, is to form a part of the national community of goods, which all the members of society are to manage. The community gives to all that of which they have need; but, in the transition state, no one can hold any office who is not a member of the community. Every member under sixty is required to work on the land or in some useful art. The citizens everywhere are divided into classes, corresponding with the useful arts; and the work in each district or commune is performed under the supervision of magistrates elected by the workmen in each class or description of industry. These chiefs of divisions of labor store away such fruits of the soil and of the arts as will bear keeping, and distribute what is laid up in the magazines to the people of the place, according to their necessities. All machines are furnished by the general community; transport is under the direction of the magistrates; taxes are payable in kind; no money is to be coined; and whatever money comes to the national community is to be used in foreign trade. The magistrates may transport workmen from one place of work to another, if it is necessary, and may impose forced work on the lazy.

This project is interesting, because, in its leading features, it anticipates the newest plans of German socialists in a number of important particulars. It did not aim at instantaneous expropriation, owing, no doubt, to the certain failure

of so bold an attempt. The attainment of the same end by abolishing inheritance was judged to be less hazardous.

The conspiracy of Babœuf was a great blessing. During the Empire and for a generation after its fall, there was, we believe, no serious attempt to dissolve social order; but there was under the Bourbons a communistic or semi-communistic literature arising in France which we cannot wholly pass by, for at length it leavens the multitude and threatens the *foundations* of society.

III.

THEORIES, ETC., OF COMMUNISM—ST. SIMON AND HIS FOLLOWERS—FOURIER.

The ways of thinking or schools that arose in France having social questions for their object, in and soon after the first third of the present century, could not, in the strict sense, be all termed communistic or socialistic. We are not called, therefore, in the discussion of socialism, to consider them particularly; nor can we go into the history of them and do justice to the prominence which some of their authors reached. Nor did they acquire importance, in any great degree, by going beyond the region of theory and imagination into the sober domain of experiment. If in a few cases they did this, the result was a failure,

as in the instances where Cabet's speculations and a modified Fourierism sought a home within the United States. Yet, as they adopted the principles of earlier communistic writers or gave new directions to communistic thinking, they need here a brief exposition. One of the first of these was St. Simonism, or the speculations of St. Simon, modified or corrupted afterward by Enfantin and Bazard. The founder of the school was a member of the noble family to which the duke of the same name, author of important memoirs published in recent times and a courtier under Louis XIV., belonged. The Count de St. Simon served in our Revolutionary War in the French army, while very young, and ended a life of misfortune and poverty in 1825, a month after the publication of his "*Nouveau Christianisme*." In this work he aimed at a new organization of Christianity, which was reduced to fraternity, with very little of its dogma left. "All society," he taught, "ought to labor for the amelioration of the moral and physical existence of the poorest class. Society ought to organize itself in a way best fitted for reaching this great end." In regard to the rewards of industrial employments, his motto was: "To each one according to his capacity; to each capacity according to its work"—which is very far from being a communistic principle.

The school of St. Simon at the time of the

July Revolution (in 1830), five years after his death, was attacked by misrepresentations which they endeavored to refute in a letter addressed to the President of the Chamber of Deputies. The attacks touched three points: the community of goods, the community of women, and connection with democratic societies. These attacks proceeded from Messrs. Maguin and Dupin, important members of the Chamber.

In answer, they admit that "the St. Simonists profess doctrines concerning the future of property and the future of women which are peculiar to them, and are connected with equally peculiar and entirely new views concerning religion, political power, and freedom; in short, concerning all the great enigmas which are at present making a stir over all Europe in a violent and extraordinary way. But these ideas of theirs are far different from those which are imputed to them."

As to community of goods, they declare that to attempt the introduction of this "would be a greater act of violence, a more outrageous injustice than the unequal division which originally was brought about by the power of arms and by conquest." They could not hold to this: "for they believe in the natural inequality of men," and think that "such community would violate the first of all moral laws which they are sent to propagate—that in future every one should have his place according to his capacity and be reward-

ed according to his works." Yet, in conformity with this law, they demand "the abolition of all privileges of birth, without exception ; and, hence, the destruction of inheritance, the greatest of all privileges."

As to the position of woman, they say that "Christianity drew woman out of slavery ; but still condemned her to subjection." The St. Simonists are come to announce her final freedom, her complete emancipation ; but without, on that account, destroying the holy law of marriage, which is proclaimed by Christianity. They demand, like the Christians, that one man be united to one woman ; but they teach that the woman shall stand on an equality with the husband, and that, according to the grace which God has specially poured on her sex, she be united to him in the triple function of temple, state, and family, so that the social individual, which until now has been the man alone, shall become in future the man and the woman.

The charge that they are allied with the existing democratic clubs, they deny, so far as to say that, although they have sympathy with these movements, their own work is of another kind—not destructive nor violent, but reformatory, and constructive of a new society in peaceful and religious ways.

Not long after this defensive letter was presented to the Chamber of Deputies, a schism be-

gan between the two successors of St. Simon—Bazard and Enfantin. Bazard, who had introduced the society of Carbonari into France, was interested in the social problems which St. Simon left almost untouched. They all believed in some kind of equality of men. How can this be united with inequality of property? Is there any absolute right to property? To this he gave, if not a new answer, at least one more thoroughly considered than it had been by St. Simon: that acquired property is truly such, but transmitted property rests only on positive law. This would lead to the abolition of inheritance. How, then, should lapsed inheritances be disposed of by the state? He solved the problem by a system of banks, which formed a sort of magistracy, empowered to find the persons best qualified to take care, through their lives, of estates thus reverting to the public. There would thus be not strictly a community of goods; but a distribution by the state, according to the capacity of persons to manage what was put into their hands. And so, on the death of each tenant, the turn of some other, well fitted for the work, would come.

Enfantin, the other leader of the sect, appears to have been a conceited, selfish man; and it seems probable that he became imbued with some of the views of Fourier relating to the intercourse of the sexes. But, however this may be, the idea

of the rehabilitation or reinstatement in its rights of the flesh was unknown to St. Simon or Bazard. When Enfantin avowed this as his doctrine, Bazard left the hall and did not appear there again. He died not long after. Others of the school—Pierre Leroux, for instance—soon followed; and, to save it from total destruction, Enfantin removed to a paternal estate in the country. The last blow the school received came from the arrest of Enfantin and three others, one of whom was Michael Chevalier, for a violation of the penal code. They were imprisoned; and, although the master or father, as they called him, lived many years afterward, he and his work fell into entire oblivion.

An important writer on the social movement in France, L. Stein, thus sums up what St. Simon, as the leader of a new school of thought, accomplished: "He first pronounced the separation of the two great classes of industrial society, employers and workmen. He first set forth, although obscurely, social reform as the only real problem of state power. He first put the question concerning inheritance, the question on which the entire future of the social form of Europe in the next two generations will depend. And, finally, with St. Simon, society, in its elements, its power, and its contradictions, was for the first time half understood, half dimly conceived of. He is the boundary stone of the modern time in France."

St. Simon seems not to have deserved the name of a profound thinker ; yet he and his successors drew to them a number of young men who afterward distinguished themselves in several departments. Buchez, author of "The Parliamentary History of the Revolution," and of a "Treatise on Politics," and President of the Constituent Assembly in 1830, was one of them. He, with his friend Bolland, left the school when Enfantin began to make his new doctrines known, and he afterward passed over into a modified Catholicism. Michael Chevalier was another. Auguste Comte was a third, who retained some of the thoughts of the school in his philosophy. We have already spoken of Pierre Leroux as joining Bazard in the schism which Enfantin occasioned. Another scholar, less known, Olinde Rodriguez, when he broke loose from Enfantin, was accused by him of heresy, and accused him in turn. "I have asserted," said he, "that in the family of St. Simon every child must know who his father is." Enfantin would have it that the woman alone should "be called to decide this serious question." He gave to the world several publications concerning the schism.

Fourier may come next, on account of his somewhat near relations to St. Simonism ; but to the doctrine of the school, rather than to that of the master. He was destined for trade ; but, losing his property early in his life, filled inferior posi-

tions with little success, and died, at the age of sixty-five, in 1837. He began to write early in the century. His principal works are "Theory of the Four Movements" and "Treatise on a Domestic Rural Association." In another publication he attacked Owen and St. Simon.

Fourier, like St. Simon, separated from the communists by not admitting the equality of members of his communities. Talent and capital are to receive their rewards, as well as work. A rule of his gives five-twelfths of the product to work, three-twelfths to talent, and four-twelfths to capital. Work itself is to have a larger dividend according as it is repulsive and difficult. He does not even absolutely cut off inheritance, so that a generation of property-holders might continue in his establishments.

Another of his ideas was to strive to make work agreeable. He would make it so by distributing it according to the inclination of the workman, by allowing him to engage in more than one employment, and by stimulating rivalries between persons employed in different occupations. The existing opinion is thoroughly wrong, he thinks, in expecting from men moral self-control. In Fourier's system every one may give free vent to his sensitive or impassioned nature; and the result is a harmony in which the poorest may have more enjoyment than kings. For instance, a friendly rivalry between the culti-

vators of a pear-orchard and an apple-orchard would give spice to their employments.

Fourier would gather a large number of persons in a vast building, calculated to hold from 1,800 to 2,000 in all. Here should be collected all the means of amusement after work was ended, and all should have liberty to partake of them. The building—called a phalanstery, as the community is called a phalanx—could be constructed at a cheaper rate than the hovels containing the same number of poor families. This, and the larger amount of work turned off, owing to the pleasure of the occupations, would greatly increase enjoyment and would give ample time to amusement. Work would become play while it lasted, and be followed by a new kind of play after the hours of work. The products of the phalanstery and its dividends would show a vast increase of profits over ordinary systems of labor. He professes to think that England could pay off her national debt by henneries and raising of eggs in half a year (Stein, ii., 506).

This is the ridiculous side of the system. Of his fantastic natural philosophy we shall say nothing. His moral philosophy consisted in holding that pleasure was the chief good; that natural desires and passions were to be gratified. It was on this basis that he aimed to make work as inviting as possible. His opinions respecting chastity and conjugal fidelity fell below those of the

degenerate portion of St. Simon's scholars. I shall not be guilty of an exaggeration if I say that they admitted into his system something very much like polyandry and polygamy.

IV.

CERTAIN RELIGIOUS SOCIALISTS—CABET—LOUIS BLANC.

St. Simonism manifested the feeling that the problem of the regeneration of society could not be solved on merely social grounds, and that a foundation of religion would be demanded by many earnest minds. Lamennais was one of these. What led him onward from his first position of a Catholic preacher of righteousness, to that of breaking with his church and of becoming a sort of tribune of the people, was the spirit of fraternity and sympathy with the lower class. At length, in 1838, in a book called the "*Livre du Peuple*," he almost reached community of goods. He there says: "That which begets dissensions, hatred, envy, is the insatiable desire of possessing more and always more, when one possesses for himself alone. Providence curses these solitary possessions. They stimulate covetousness without ceasing, and satisfy it never. There is no enjoyment in goods, unless they are divided." And again: "From the holy maxims of equality,

liberty, and fraternity, immovably established, the organization of society will emanate."

Another form, in which this religion of fraternity appeared, has been called the *theosophic*, and it showed itself in the minds of religious dreamers, who were half Christians, with a governing spirit of demagoguery. The Abbé Constant was one of these. He says that "God is everything and everything is God, and that a grain of sand is God," perhaps having no definitely pantheistic meaning in this. He says again: "Nothing on the earth belongs to this or that man. All belongs to God. That is to say, to all." Here, too, he may have no definite notion of what he is saying; but when he says, the community will be the perfect society, he means what communists mean. This man is said by Stein to have taught that in a good time coming marriage would cease; that a man and woman should unite without reserve, and the birth of a child should constitute the marriage; and, since God is love, if love did not last in such marriage, it came forthwith to an end. Another such man is one Esquiros, who wrote the "People's Gospel" and the "People's Gospel Defended," in 1840, 1841, and says that "the community is altogether in the spirit of Christianity, and that the doctrine of Christ is the enemy of most governments, as they are at present constituted."

We pass from these to another religious writer,

who originally belonged to the sect of the St. Simonists, but withdrew when Enfantin revealed his licentious doctrines. Pierre Leroux, one of the most learned men of his time, estimable and pure, after this breach with his friends, gave himself up to learning and writing. One of the products was a new but murky and fantastic religious philosophy. Another was a social system in which equality was the foundation. He seems to have condemned property; yet he stopped, like his teacher, St. Simon, short of the strictest systems of communism.

Two of his scholars have given a *resumé* of his social principles, from which I will cite a few passages. "Each and all have a right to property. Property is the natural right of every one to use a determinate thing in the way which the law points out.

"Society, the collective centre, is the field and place of labor of each man; from society each one borrows the science he applies, the instruments he employs, the materials he transforms. It is society, in fact, which furnishes him with all his means of production. In every fact of production, the social centre, as a whole, has a concern, under the title of detaining in its possession the instruments of labor and the primary materials, under the title of suggester of thoughts and motives, and under that of dividing up products and means of work. Labor is demanded by

society from the industrial man, the artist, the scholar."

Society divides up by its administrative power, products and means of labor of all kinds. The formula of rewarding the various labors is to each according to his capacities, to his labor, to his needs.

In this scheme everything is communistic except the plan of rewarding the laborers, which is borrowed from St. Simon.

We come next to a more pronounced communist, Etienne Cabet, who was by profession an advocate, and in politics was, at the time of the Bourbon restoration, a very decided radical. In 1834, being compromised in a revolt, he went as an exile to England, and there employed his leisure in studying social problems. One of the fruits of his leisure was his "Voyage to Icaria," a Utopia after the pattern of Sir Thomas More's, in three parts. The first part describes and sets forth a nation in the communistic condition; the second part is designed to show how such a community can proceed from the actual state of a nation; while the third contains a *resumé* of the doctrine or principles of the community. Wishing to carry out his ideas, he crossed the Atlantic in 1848, and before his death, at St. Louis, in 1856, had planted his colony. The colony and other subsequent offshoots have been, on the whole, unsuccessful, and we must believe that he had no gift to conduct such an enterprise.

About 1841 Cabet published his communistic creed in Paris, from which we extract a few articles, sometimes abridged, but generally in a close translation of the author's words :

“ I believe that nature has intended the earth to be possessed in community and undivided, like the light, heat, and air ; that she has pointed out division only for production and things indispensable for the needs of the individual, and that community is the most natural system. I believe that property is a purely human invention and institution. I believe that the institution can be good and useful only in case the earth were divided among all men, and each one had an equal share, which, according to its nature, should be inalienable. I believe that the acceptance of the right of property among all nations, in connection with its inequality and alienability, is an error, perhaps the most disastrous of all errors.” “ I believe that the evils rising from private property must continue whilst its cause continues, and that, in order to suppress the effect, the right of property must cease.”

In respect to marriage, his faith is that it is the relation of the sexes most in conformity with the dignity of our nature, and the best calculated to secure individual happiness and order in the community ; that what evils attend on it at present will disappear when equality and community prevail ; and that all men not only ought to marry,

but would incline so to do when the community secured to them, in payment for moderate work, the necessary means of subsistence. So also the present affection between parents and children, however strong it might be, would then produce no single one of those evils which it creates in the present system of inequality.

Since the national territory belongs, like an undivided estate, to society, society or its representatives ought to take care of it and see to its cultivation by the citizens, that they should collect the fruits, put in different *ateliers* all that is necessary for food, clothing, and dwellings, and see to the distribution. Such a kind of cultivation of the soil, he believes, would have for its result the suppression of boundaries between the fields of neighbors, the cultivation of waste lands, far better agriculture and economy, together with a double, triple, or even tenfold amount of production.

In regard to industry in the community, his belief is that society ought to divide and direct work, to place and regulate the workshops (*ateliers*), and to distribute the workmen. Machines in a communistic system can never be enough multiplied, and human intelligence must find the means to limit the office of the workmen to the mere management of them. Everything possible must be done to make work as easy and pleasant as possible. All kinds of work must be regarded to be alike honorable. All citizens must be work-

men ; every one must, as far as possible, choose the profession most congenial to him ; and all must work an equal number of hours. "I believe," he says, in closing this article of his creed respecting industry, "that such a system of industry will be followed by the avoidance of double employments and losses, by great savings, and, at the least, by a tenfold increase of fabrics." He adds, in a subsequent article : "I believe that the opinion which rejects communism as a chimera is only a prejudice, and must yield to study and investigation." And, on the important point how this system is to be introduced, he declares that it must not come in by force. "If a minority, against the will of the great and small proprietors, should seek to abolish the right of property, and to force the present wealthy class to work, this attempt, overthrowing all past usage, all confidence and all existence, would meet with more hindrances than any social or political revolution has ever had to encounter." The bare resistance presented by sluggishness would be enough to shipwreck the project. Only public opinion, acting through the will of the people, with the consent of all, or at least of the great majority, and through law, can make it an actual institution. And, in case of a popular reform or revolution, a transitional or preparatory political form would be necessary. Only democracy would be adequate to this task of introducing communism through a system by

which inequalities would be gradually lessened and equality increased, thus making the road open for full communism.

Thus Utopia has come down out of the clouds and planted her feet on terra firma. Friendly argument, peaceful conference can make all her speculations real in reference to the greatest change in society ever contemplated in the world. We cannot but praise M. Cabet for the kindly and humane spirit of his creed; but benevolence and the regeneration of men, with no forces save nakedly human ones, are hardly enough. He reminds us of the French dancing-master who tried to teach wild Indians to dance, while neither party knew the dialect of the other. "Messieurs Sauvages," said he, with the politeness of his country, "will you have the goodness to put yourselves in the first position?"

But we turn to a man of another kind, and the last Frenchman whom we shall include in these brief sketches. Louis Blanc, born in 1813, the youngest among the more important socialists of France, and still living, is distinguished by his historical writings; and was so prominent in his party at the downfall of Louis Philippe, in 1848, that he was chosen a member of the Provisional Government. He was, however, compromised in the disturbances of May, 1848, and, to avoid prosecution, fled to England, where he resided many years. Here he continued and com-

pleted his great work on the French Revolution, in twelve volumes. He had already written his "History of Ten Years," and his "Organization of Labor," which is the expression of his social or communistic principles.

His social starting-point is no new one. "It is not the man who is responsible for his wrongdoings, but society; and, hence, a society on a good basis will make the individual man good." The evils of slavery flow from inequality, and that from property. Property, then, is the great scourge of society; it is the veritable public crime." Government should be considered as the supreme regulator of production, and be invested with power enough to accomplish its task. It should raise money, which should be appropriated, without payment of interest, for the creation of social workshops (*ateliers*) in the most important branches of national industry. In these workshops the operatives should choose their own overseers, and there should be the same wages for all. They should form a solidarity among themselves, and, when united with agricultural labor, would consolidate in one the whole industry of the country. The enormous sums necessary for this organization of labor could in part be derived from the abolition of collateral inheritances. The effect of thus aiding the *ateliers* would obviously be to render it impossible for private undertakers to compete with the national

shops. Thus concurrence would cease, and private work yield first or last to the public or communistic system.

In 1848 the system of Louis Blanc was so far put to the test that public *ateliers* were opened, and in Paris 150,000 workmen were employed in them, at a daily expense of \$50,000. National ruin was near if the system should continue. The workmen were also a dangerous element in the population. The *émeute* of May, and that of June in the same year, 1848, in which many of the workmen in these national *ateliers* took part, furnished a pretext for putting an end to the experiment.

Louis Blanc did not seek to interfere with the family. But, while he says that the family is a natural fact, which on any hypothesis cannot be destroyed, he adds that inheritance has a conventional character, with which the progress of society can do away. "The family comes from God; inheritance from men. The family is, like God, holy and immortal; inheritance is destined to follow the same direction which societies may take in their transformation."

When Louis Blanc encounters the objections made to the destruction of the social system, it is by the reply that it would be only a transitory condition, through which the world would pass to something better. He did not say much on community of goods; but his organization of labor

took its place. The great importance of what he did, lay not in the novelty of his suggestions; but in his bringing the minds of men to a practical point, where the transformation of society could begin, without any preparatory overturning. He had, perhaps, a greater part in preparing the way for the German socialism than any other single Frenchman.

CHAPTER IV.

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

I.

WITH the progress of the French Revolution some very important changes made their way among the industrial classes, both in France and in other parts of Europe. In France the peasantry, or serfs of the feudal times, became to a large extent proprietors of small farms, and now constitute the largest class of independent workmen in the nation. In the towns the industry of the citizens, or *bourgeoisie*, as we shall call them, received a great stimulus from the new freedom; while the greater use and cost of machinery rendered it increasingly difficult for the operative to emerge from his condition into that of an employer or undertaker. Meanwhile, the feeling of equality, stimulated by the Revolution, made the operative feel that he was depressed below his rightful position—a feeling which was rendered the more bitter by his notion of equality, as implying equality of condition, and by the harping

of the demagogues on this string. Thus there grew up, almost of necessity, a division in the working-class of the towns between those who formed the standing *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat*, as the agitators delighted to call the standing class of operatives; meaning, by this Roman term for the lowest class in that republic, those who had only hands to work with and no laid-up capital. This strife appears in the earlier part of the Revolution. The Directory, when Babœuf's conspiracy broke out, put it down, as an attack on capital, which might destroy both the republic and the property which was necessary for its industrial prosperity. The Directory triumphed; but the alienation between labor and capital was not cured and is not in the process of being cured. It is this strife, or feeling that they have separate interests from the *bourgeoisie* and the capitalists, which now forms the strong point for agitation everywhere, wherever industry is flourishing; which gives a force to communistic arguments; which enables popular leaders to consolidate them into a class; which in some countries clouds the prospect for the future, affects politics in a way unknown a century ago, and perplexes the most adroit of statesmen.

It is worthy of remark how this strife of classes has widened the breach between the classes in the minds of the parties interested, and, to some extent, in the minds also of thinking persons.

There are really no such marked lines as the communistic writers have drawn between men in modern society. The holder of a few acres of land in his own right, the small shopkeeper, the various artisans on a small scale in towns and villages have some resemblances to the *proletariat* and some to the *bourgeoisie*. Any fundamental change in society would bring no more prosperity to them in a material point of view, or help them more to rise in the social scale. These classes, then, have no motive to welcome revolutions. If there was to be a repartition of all property in equal shares, their shares would be little, if at all, increased. And all the while, in all the countries of Europe and America, education, both general and in the arts of industry, is becoming larger and more open; so that they may expect that their children will have better chances in life than they had when they were young. Now, these classes or departments of human laborers make up the majority of all who work for their living. It is, then, a minority in most countries that composes the discontented and embittered mass; it is, in the main, the operatives whom improved machinery brings together in large establishments, who are able to influence each other to common action, that can be stirred by eloquent socialists. It is these between whom and the capitalists, the employers, the transporters, a running fight subsists, with intervals of rest, but with no perma-

ment peace. The fight does no good in the end, for strikes can never establish healthy relations between employer and employed. The methods of getting rid of employers and capitalists only mitigate the evil to a slight extent. The state, as at present constituted, cannot do anything effectual to promote peace between the parties, except by such temporary expedients as arbitration; and so the workingmen take the matter into their own hands and form associations for themselves.

These associations and the prominence given to questions of political economy may be said to be the characteristics of the most modern *communist*, or we will say *socialistic* movements. And another peculiarity of the more modern times is the spread of socialism itself through European countries and even in both Americas.

The history of this spread of socialistic opinions by association it is not easy to give; nor would it be edifying, unless we could trace some of the particulars more minutely than it is in our power to do with our materials and within our limits. As it is a characteristic of the age to be international; as clubs and associations have become far more common since the Revolutionary period began; as the operatives who have intelligence and education are far more numerous than formerly, and the circulation of knowledge by the system of post-offices is greatly facilitated; it is not strange that plans and views prevailing in

one country should travel into another. Nor is it strange that attempts should be made to unite the operatives of all lands in one great association.

In 1848, when Louis Philippe lost his throne, there was apprehension from the communists in Paris ; and one motive to support the new Empire was the need of a strong conservative government for the continuance of social order. The same dread was inspired by the other revolutions which in quick succession followed that in France. The socialists themselves were becoming international. Thus we find Karl Marx floating as a pronounced socialist in the decade beginning with 1840 between France and Germany ; banished from France in 1844, and taking refuge in Belgium ; banished from Belgium, and returning to his native land ; editing a journal in Cologne in 1848, which was suppressed by the political authorities in 1849 ; thence fleeing to Paris, and ere long to London, where he has ever since resided. The outbreaks of '48 revealed a danger to existing institutions which in part proceeded from the communistic leaven ; and, accordingly, the police of the Continental states increased in its preventive, as well as in its detective vigilance against the secret foes of order. A number of persons imbued with socialistic principles found England the safest country to live in. Expression of obnoxious political or social opinions was there com-

paratively free; there chartism had been suppressed and secret clubs had never been the fashion; there the reform bill and a change in the corn laws, with other wise legislation having the welfare of all classes in view, quieted and in a measure united the nation; so that the old right of free speech could be safely granted to persons, few of whom were natives, since they were too insignificant to be noticed, although holding opinions, in the estimation of Englishmen, the most pernicious.

Before the formation of the "International Workingmen's Association," at London, in 1864, it had occurred to some persons to found such a union on international principles. As early as 1840 a society existed in London for the benefit of German operatives, called the *Arbeiterbildungsverein*, which counted Englishmen, Frenchmen, Swedes, Poles, and Hungarians among its members, and had some connection with workingmen's societies on the Continent. It is said by Jäger, in his "Socialismus," that a woman of Geneva conceived the idea, in 1849, of uniting all associations of operatives into one great whole. And a little before this a manifesto "of the communist party," in which Marx had a leading hand, called on the proletariats of all lands to unite. This manifesto demanded the abolition of private property in the soil; centralization of credit in a state bank; union of the means of intercourse in

the hands of the state ; national workshops ; fertilizing and tilling the soil on a common prescribed plan ; and gratuitous instruction. A union of communists was then called to meet at Brussels ; but the February Revolution in 1848 brought on a reaction and discouraged further movements. Several Germans who were active in this project appear again in the International—as Marx, Engels, Liebknecht ; the latter of whom spoke of it afterward as designed to have its headquarters at London.

There may have been a reason for an association embracing all Europe, which we have not yet noticed. If the communists could not be organized and ready for action everywhere at once, it would happen that, when the time for the “emancipation of workingmen” should arrive, one nation would bear the brunt of the revolt, and the others be ready to afford it assistance. Or, if the existing form of society could be overthrown in one land, in others the government could be forewarned and forearmed.

The immediate impulse to the formation of the International was given in 1862, when the Government of France sent over to London a number of skilled workmen to gather up what information they could respecting the progress of the arts from the exposition of that year. And again, in 1863, Odger, a well-known English socialist, “urged the holding of a general workingmen’s congress, in order to prevent foreign workmen

from coming into a land where wages were high, and causing a decline in them. The French workmen, on their return home, gained the assent of their comrades for the matter, and it was agreed that there should be a meeting at London the next year" (Jäger).

A meeting took place, accordingly, on the 28th of September, at which the veteran conspirator, Mazzini, made an address, although having little in common with the object for which the meeting was convened. His goal was a political one. He was for a strong central power, which should begin a movement; while the essence of the International movement was a federal association, a combination of movements in part already begun, with the social end in view of raising the operatives up over against the employers and capitalists. To them political power was a means; and to Mazzini, who seems to have had no thought of overthrowing society, it was an end. Marx also made an address and proposed a series of statutes. In his address there was little of agitation, and the plan of the association was not unfolded at large; but he pointed toward a system in which wages should disappear, and the working-class should hold in their hands the means of production furnished by nature. These things must become the property of the state, which could be effected only when the power of the state passed over into socialistic hands.

A few words are needed to explain the organization and working power of the International, which is in the main simple and efficient.

The general statutes state that the association is founded to serve as a centre of union and of systematical co-operation between the workingmen's societies in various lands, which have the common aim of the protection, advancement, and entire emancipation of the working-class. A general congress assembles yearly, which consists of deputies from the several branches, and determines the time and place of the next congress; for the assembling of which, after such determination, no special invitation is required. The congress from year to year fixes the seat of the general council and names its members. The council may add new members to its body; must present a yearly report of its proceedings; and can, in pressing cases, call a new congress before its regular time for sitting. The council consists of workingmen of the countries represented in the associations, and fills the places necessary for carrying on business out of the members of its own body. It serves as the medium of communication between the various national and local groups of the association; "so that the workmen of a land may remain constantly informed of the movements of their class in all other lands; that an investigation into the social condition of the various lands of Europe may take place at the

same time and under common guidance; that questions of general interest, started by one society, may be taken up by all others; and that, should immediate practical steps be necessary—as, for instance, in international disputes—the united associations may take action at the same time and in a uniform way.”

Among the rules for the proceedings of the International, which were enacted at various times from 1866 onward, we mention the following: Every association, section, or group sends one member to the congress, whose expenses his constituency is expected to defray. Where the number of members exceeds five hundred, for every additional five hundred a new member may be sent. In countries where the law prohibits branch associations of the International, deputies may be admitted to the congresses for the purposes of debate on questions of principle only. A contribution of one penny, or ten centimes, is required from all sections and associations connected with the International. The plan, if fully matured, of the associations would be in the ascending order, groups and sections in a city or town; federations or unions in a place or territory where the different sections can unite together; and the General International Workingmen's Association crowning all. As this has a general council of fifty members, with London for its seat; so each federation is expected to have a central com-

mittee or council, and each section has its own particular statutes. Each federation has power to admit or suspend local sections, and must make report of its doings every three months. The federations are expected to hold congresses steadily, and the smaller unions to have their own particular meetings.

The next subject which will call for our attention will be the spread of the International; after which we shall consider its action and history, especially as revealed by its general congresses, until 1872, when it fell under the ban of Europe.

II.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONTINUED.

The details in regard to the spread of this workingmen's association, as it respects the number of its members and its ramifications, would be unprofitable and could not be relied upon with entire confidence. Thus we find that the number of English members was stated by Dupont, the secretary of the general council, to be 25,173 in 1866; and by Applegarth, one of the members of the same council, to be 95,000; while 10,000 is accepted as a more correct estimate by Jäger, the historian of socialism. In some countries, again, the restrictions imposed by govern-

ments must have prevented many from joining the association. In Germany, where it had any foothold, its progress was impeded until 1869 by the Workingmen's Union, an earlier society, founded by Lassalle; and the laws prevented branches of foreign associations from existing in Prussia. But in France, until 1871, it was strong and revolutionary. In Switzerland, where it was free to spread, it embraced, one would think, all the operatives. In Belgium also it had an extensive membership, while in Holland few cared anything about it. In Austria there seem to have been no capable leaders who could unite a party together, and the German Workingmen's Union had already preoccupied this field. When, in 1869, the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party was founded, at Eisenach, nearly 100,000 Austrian operatives were represented by delegates, of which number 59,000 belonged to Vienna and 25,000 to Bohemia. In Spain it had many adherents—according to some, 100,000; according to others, 40,000. It crossed over the Atlantic, and established itself by the side of associations already existing in the United States, which had private relations toward capitalists, rather than the revolution of society, in view.

In speaking of what the International and its subordinate branches have done to declare and define their objects, we must give our testimony to the ability and the general moderation with

.

which the reports submitted to congresses, and other declarations of principles, have been prepared. The association contains an amount of talent which no one has a right to despise. Part of this talent, as it seems, pertains to "*head-workers*," or the "*intellectual proletariat*." At one of the congresses it was made a question whether any but "*hand-workers*" should be members of the International. The French members, who had had unpleasant experiences with the men of the tongue and pen, opposed their entrance. They urged the danger which there would be in letting advocates and journalists have an influence over the meetings of men of work. But the plan was carried by the English and German members.

The first general congress met at Geneva, Sept. 3d-8th, 1866. It had been voted to hold a congress at Brussels, in 1865; but hindrances put in the way of the French socialists, and the unwillingness of the Belgian government to allow a meeting within its borders, caused it to be postponed until the next year. The congress of the next year, or 1866, sat at Geneva; but did little that looked toward the goal of the association. They favored counting eight hours' labor as a day's work; they denounced the labor of women in manufactories, "as a cause of the degeneration and demoralization of the human race;" they rebuked trades' unions for occupying them-

selves with immediate contests, instead of acting against the system of capital itself : they favored co-operative labor, but thought that it ought to be generalized and not have a special form given to it ; they proposed a confederation of all the workingmen's banks, with the view of ultimately uniting them in a central establishment, under the association ; they unanimously condemned permanent or standing armies, and approved of the general armament of the people and their instruction in the handling of arms."

The next congress met at Lausanne, in September, 1867, under the presidency of Eugene Dupont, secretary of the general council. Seventy-one delegates were present. Among the points here discussed was that contained in the question whether "the emancipation of the *fourth* estate (or working-class) might not result in the formation of a *fifth*, the situation of which might be more miserable still." The prevailing opinion was that the actual efforts of the workingmen's associations, if they preserved their existing form, might have this effect ; but that this danger "would disappear in proportion as the development of modern industry should render production on a small scale impossible. Modern production on a great scale fuses together individual efforts and renders co-operative industry a necessity for all." To obviate this danger, the "proletariat" must become convinced that social trans-

formation can operate only by means acting on the whole of society, etc.

On the subject of education, embraced in another question for discussion, the congress declares "that it concedes to the state no other right than that of taking the place of a father of a family when he is unable to fulfil his duty. At all events, all religious instruction ought to be removed from the programme."

In the report on the definition of the part which the state has to act we find the following views expressed: "The efforts of nations ought to tend to make the state the holder of the means of transport and of circulation, in order to annihilate the powerful monopoly of the great companies, which, by submitting the working-class to their arbitrary rules, attack at once both the dignity of man and the liberty of the individual."

At the same congress a report was read which is interesting, as showing the state of war between the International and the capitalists. The master basket-makers of London gave notice to their men that they must dissolve their association within three days and agree to take lower wages, or be locked out of the shops. The workmen declined to accept of the terms, and the employers, aware of what their decision would be, had sent for Belgian workmen to take their place. They had arrived, and were kept from all contact from all other workmen, as far as possible. "But

the council-general of the International made out to get within the '*cordon sanitaire*,' and by a stratagem made themselves known to the Belgian workmen. On the morrow the workmen, having comprehended what was their duty, returned to Belgium, having been indemnified for their lost time by the basket-makers' society at London." Another detachment of laborers from the same country was in the same way persuaded to go home.

The leaders of the International cared nothing for strikes, in themselves considered; but regarded them as desirable means of bringing about the good time when private capital should cease to be. The strikes would unite the operatives by close ties, as common sufferers and as having common enemies. They would turn the eyes of the operatives toward the International, thus increasing its strength and importance. They would make capital more odious and open laborers' eyes to the advantages of universal combination. When the end should be gained and the state should become the only capitalist, strikes would become impossible. The workmen who should strike then might as well hang themselves outright.

At the congresses of Brussels and Bâle, in 1868 and 1869, a discussion sprang up on property, which showed some difference of opinion. De Paepe, of Brussels, in a report, had spoken of

“certain measures of general reform” proposed by divers socialists. These were the transformation of national banks into banks of gratuitous credit; the making of the soil a part of the collective property of society; the abolition of inheritance *ab intestat*, outside of certain degrees of relationship; and the laying of a tax on succession in the direct line. Citizen Tolain, speaking on the subject of making the soil collective property, admitted that certain kinds of property ought to become collective; other kinds, by their nature, ought to remain individual. To this De Paepe replied that Tolain wanted canals, roads, mines to become the collective property of society; but he himself would extend that idea so far as to include all landed property [property in the soil or resting on it]. Coullery, of La Chaux de Fonds, avowed himself a partisan of individual property. The soil, he said, was an instrument of labor. It ought to belong to the laborer by the same title with every other utensil. If you make the soil collective property, why not extend your theory to all instruments of labor? This would be logical, but would be absurd.

We refer to this difference of opinion as showing that the extreme theorists had not yet got complete ascendancy. And yet they alone comprehended where the theory must carry them. If persons like Coullery had had their way, the whole scheme would have been an abortion.

The congress of Brussels met in September, 1868, and was largely attended; but its doings show a repetition of the opinions expressed at the previous congresses. On the question of strikes the congress decided that, in the actual struggle between labor and capital, they were legitimate and necessary; and recommended that, in each federation, there should be a council of arbitration, to decide on their seasonableness and justifying causes in future. On a question touching machines, among other things the council declared that machines, like all other instruments of labor, should belong to the laborers; but that this end could be reached only by co-operative associations and a system of mutual credit, and that at present there is room for intervening in the introduction of machines into the workshops, so far that they should not be introduced without certain guarantees and compensations to the laborer. On a question relating to property, the congress decided that the ways of communication and forests ought to be held as common property, and passed the same resolution respecting the soil, mines, quarries, coal-pits, and railroads.

Dupont, general secretary of the International and one of the vice-presidents at this congress, in a speech at the close of the proceedings, said: "What we wish to overthrow is, not the tyrant, but tyranny. We want no governments any

longer, for governments oppress us by taxes; we want no armies any longer, for armies butcher and murder us; we want no religion any longer, for religions stifle the understanding."

The congress of Basel met in September, 1869, and numbered eighty members. A committee, appointed to consider the question of property, brought the subject before the congress under two heads. They proposed that it should declare, first, that society has the right of abolishing individual property in the soil and of causing it to belong to the community; secondly, that it is necessary that the soil should become collective property. After debate, in which some contended that individual property was the source of all social miseries and inequalities, and that, "as having its origin in violence and usurpation, it ought to disappear, and give way to landed property, regulated by communes organized as federations," only four stood up for individual property. The first proposition was carried by 54 to 4, and the second by 53 to 4.

The subject of inheritance, which had not been discussed at any previous congress, was also brought forward at Basel, in a proposition to adopt the following resolution:

"Considering that the right of inheritance, which is an element inseparable from individual property, tends to alienate property in the soil and social riches, to the benefit of some and to the detriment of the greater number; that, by

consequence, the right of inheritance is an obstacle, preventing the soil and social riches from becoming a part of the collective property ;

“ That, on the other hand, the right of inheritance, however restricted in its operation, constitutes a privilege, the greater or less importance of which does not destroy its iniquity in point of right, and which is a standing menace to social right ;

“ That, further, it is an essential element of all kinds of inequality, because it prevents individuals from having the same means of development, both moral and material ;

“ Considering, finally, that the congress has pronounced in favor of the collectivity of landed property, and that this declaration would be illogical if it was not corroborated by that which now follows ;

“ The congress recognizes the principle that the right of inheritance ought to be completely and radically abolished, and that this abolition is one of the most indispensable conditions of the emancipation of labor.”

This report did not meet with entire acceptance. One member proposed transitory measures, to make the passage smoother from the present state of things. Another, in the name of his section, proposed a limitation in respect of degrees of kindred. If reduced to its minimum, he thought that “ individual inheritance was only an element of progress and morality. He did not believe in its efficacy as a means of social liquidation.”

When the vote was taken on this proposition, 32 delegates were in favor of it, 23 against it, while 17 abstained from voting.

At the same congress a report was presented

by the delegates of the section of Brussels, of which, for want of room, we can only cite the closing words: "One of two things must be true. Either the socialists who demand the abolition of inheritance confine themselves to this single reform—and in that case we claim that they none the less retain the distinction of capitalists and laborers, consequently '*parasitism*' for the one and pauperism for the others—or they demand besides that the soil become collective property; that the capitalists' deductions from the laborers' wages be done away with; that instruments of labor be put in the hands of the laborers as their possession; that integral instruction be given to all; and, in that case, we claim that the abolition of inheritance is, to say the least, useless and superfluous."

We shall finish what we have to say of the International in the next article.

III.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONCLUDED.

It was determined at Basel that the next congress of the International should be held in September, 1870, at Paris. But on the 15th of July of that year war was declared by France against Prussia, and no congress was held, either at Paris or elsewhere, although an effort was made to

have one convened at Mainz. The next year, in consequence, no doubt, of the bad odor in which the International then was, a congress was not summoned; but a private conference met at London, the proceedings of which were of small importance. The congress for 1872 was appointed to meet at the Hague, in Holland; the reason for meeting there being that "the existing persecutions of the International by the governments both in France and in Germany do not allow the calling of the congress either to Paris or to Mainz."

In the course of this year a new section of the International was formed at Geneva, by a very remarkable man, Michael Bakunin by name, a Russian Nihilist and a fugitive from his country, who was arrested and condemned to death in the Saxon and Austrian courts and then delivered over to Russian authorities. Sent to Siberia, he escaped, and reappeared in Western Europe, where he figures as the most extreme of radicals. In a speech, made at the third session of the Congress of Berne, he declared, that religion was not simply a disorder of the brain; but was also a passionate and perpetual protestation of the entire nature of man and of the infinite riches of the human heart against the narrowness and the misery of reality. Religion will be almighty as long as unreason and unrighteousness reign on earth. If we give the earth back what belongs

to her, that is happiness and fraternity religion will have no longer a reason for its existence.

Bakunin did not like communism, because "it concentrated all the powers of society in and transferred them to the state; because it necessarily leads to the centralization of property in the state, while he desired the abolition of the state altogether."

At the formation above referred to of the Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, the following programme was adopted by Bakunin and his friends: "The alliance declares itself atheistic. It desires the abolition of worship; the substitution of science for faith and of human justice for divine justice; the abolition of marriage, so far as it is a political, religious, judicial, and civil institution." To this it adds some of the commonplaces of the social system—as the abolition of inheritance and the conversion of every kind of property into collective property, for the purpose of being utilized by rural and industrial associations. It recognizes the fact that all existing states and bodies invested with authority must disappear in the universal union of free associations; and declares that the social question cannot find its definitive and real solution except on the basis of the universal and international solidarity of all countries; and, therefore, discards all politics founded on so-called patriotism and on the rivalry of nations."

This atheistic section—which also seems to have been a secret society—had applied for admission in the preceding April into the “Romand,” or Swiss federation, and was received by a majority of three, 21 voting for and 18 against its admission. Thereupon the non-contents withdrew from the congress, and the schism was lasting. In the general congress at the Hague the question of declaring the “Alliance,” founded by Bakunin, international, was put into the hands of a committee, which proposed the exclusion of the Alliance, and especially that of Bakunin and another member, from the General Association, on the ground of their having formed a secret society. This report was accepted; but the persons concerned declared that they would not obey the vote. At a congress of the Swiss federation, held the same year, at St. Imier, in Bern, it was unanimously resolved by the sections represented to reject the resolutions passed at the Hague. There could be no other course after this than for the general council at London to suspend the sections, and for the next congress to confirm its action.

The International, just after the close of its session at the Hague, lost some other members by their voluntary abandonment of a connection with the Association. These were members of the Commune at Paris who carried things to an extreme, belonging to the clique of which Blan-

qui was the head, and who were also members of the International. One of these had presided at the congress; several were members of the general council at London. They complain that the International Association had not done its work; had not enough stimulated the political activity of the proletariat. It ought to be not a league of co-operative unions, nor a society for supporting strikes. It should be, rather, the international vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat. In withdrawing from the International, however, they give the assurance that they will not withdraw from action. "We have but one object: the reorganization of the workingmen's party in the shape best fitted for striking a blow, in France as well as in any other land, and under the banner of social revolution. In France it is absolutely necessary to keep the plans of the socialistic revolutionary party strictly separate from those of the International. There the future of the revolution lies in the hands of the proletariat of the towns, which singly and alone has a revolutionary spirit. Above all things must every contact with the *bourgeoisie* be avoided; at no cost should a compromise be made with parties in that interest."

From these words it is plain that the International was now brought into extreme perplexity, into difficulties which were unavoidable and resulted from its very constitution. On the one

hand, it had a transitional policy, to encourage the union and common feeling of the laboring class by encouraging strikes and trades-unions and every method of joint action, save war. War it did not seek, at least as an immediate object, and the protests were loud against the Franco-German war, when it was in prospect. On the other hand, it avowedly kept one object in view, the overturning of society in its present shape, and a reconstruction in which all classes but one should disappear. Every man who had property, however invested, within the country, looked forward to the triumph of socialism as the ruin of himself and his family. Every state and all interested in upholding the state or in maintaining individual rights, as they are understood in civilized communities, interpreted a socialistic state as an overturn begun by civil war, and sure to involve the destruction of every existing thing except a state and operatives paid by that state. Was it strange, now, that many on both sides honestly believed that the new millennium could not come in without force; although the International held out hopes that suffrage, opposing the interests of capital and a conviction of the unavoidable change, would make the upper classes, when the time should come, willing to yield without fighting?

This, also, we think, was a necessary result of the agitations attendant on the existence of such

organizations as the International, that the passions of the ignorant and unreflecting were of necessity excited beyond the limits of reason. Socialism could not live and thrive without agitation. To foster and increase the agitation, the line between the operative and the employer must be widened and rendered more precise; the feeling of wrong must be intensified. The capitalist must be looked on as a thief. I venture to say that no equal intolerance, between parties in politics or in religion on the large scale, can be shown in any crisis of change or strife. The leaders in the socialistic movement—able men, who ought to have their own tempers at command—show a malignant spirit that a man conscious of a good cause should be ashamed of. Thus, in the communistic manifest prepared in 1847 by Marx and Engels, two very able men whose equals would take a foremost place in any party, do not scruple to write as follows: "For the rest, nothing is more laughable than the highly moral horror of our *bourgeois* at the pretendedly official [accounts of] the community of wives among the communists. The communists need not introduce community of wives, for it has almost always existed. Our *bourgeois*, not content with having the wives and daughters of the *proletariat* at their disposal, find a chief pleasure in seducing each other's wives. Civil marriage is in reality the community of wives." As for

these words we only ask, how a man could be believed in any statement afterward, who would send forth stuff into the world. But, to turn to another form of this malignity, we cite a passage from a letter of Dupont, a secretary of the general council of the International at London, written a day or two after the disaster at Sedan: "Nothing is changed. The power is still in the hands of the *bourgeois*. In these circumstances, the rôle of the workmen—or, rather, their duty—is to let this '*vermine bourgeoisie*' make peace with the Prussians, for the shame of the act will never be wiped off from them," etc. "The *bourgeoisie*, who are charmed with their triumph, will not at once perceive the progress of our Association, and for the day of real war the operatives will be ready." And, to give one sample more, one Sylvis, then president of the "National Labor Union of the United States," writes from Philadelphia, in May, 1869, as follows: "Our last war has had for its result to build up the most infamous financial aristocracy in the whole world. This money power pumps the substance of the people. We have declared war against it, and think that we shall gain the victory. We shall first try suffrage; but, if it fails, we shall have recourse to more efficacious measures. A little blood-letting is sometimes necessary in desperate cases." The man perhaps was a very mild person; but the style of the class required him to

say something sanguinary. He died soon after writing the letter.

The International suffered to such a degree from its alleged complicity in the horrors of the spring of 1871 that it has not since recovered. The question may be asked, to what degree was it answerable for those crimes? As far as we can discover, it had little direct blame for them, however much the general council at London might try to whitewash the villanies of the insurgents, and to blacken the deeds of the government's army: and the members of it at Paris, as far as we can discover, were not among those who approved of the burning of the public buildings in Paris, or of the murder of the hostages, that most fiendish of crimes. The question is not an easy one to resolve, nor have we many materials for a satisfactory solution; but, as far as we can discover, the case stands thus:

1. The authorities of the International appear to have taken, before the war, no active part in bringing it on. What individuals may have wished or done, they were not responsible for these horrors. At the congress of the Hague the delegates from Spain, Belgium, and the Federation of the Jura proposed to do away with the general council. They asserted that its present power was too great, and that a bureau of statistical correspondence would be enough for the wants of the Association. They added that "the gen-

eral council would never lead men to the barricades. They had thus far neither instigated an insurrection nor organized one ; but, on the contrary, taken hold of things in a repressive way. The majority in the congress replied that the general council did not exist for the purpose of initiating a revolution. They appeared on the scene only to give help, as in the strike of the bronze-workers at Paris, that in Newcastle, etc. If it had not done enough, the cause lay in its limited power" (from Jäger).

2. The Commune of Paris was elected by the revolutionary body in possession of the city, on the 26th of March, 1871, after the preliminary peace of Feb. 26th, made by the legislative body at Versailles with the Prussians. The Commune consisted normally of eighty representatives of the quarters of the "arrondissements" of the city. To this body belonged a large number of socialists, but a minority of the members of the International. These last, however, seem to have been the most moderate, the most able, of the representatives in the Commune. A French authority says that "in the brief history of the Commune the members of the International played the most serious and the least violent rôle. They furnished the Commune with men of administration and theory—such as Theisz at the posts ; Frankel in the department of industry ; Vaillant in that of public instruction ; Beslay in

the Bank; Vésinier in the *Officiel* [journal of the Commune], who gave for a moment to this unprincipled and aimless *émeute* an appearance of regularity and life: they voted intrepidly against violent measures, against the committee of public safety. They pursued the object which the socialists had in view throughout. 'We ought not to forget,' said Frankel, in the session of May 12th, 'that the revolution has been made exclusively by the working-class. If we do nothing for this class, I see no reason for the existence of the Commune.' And it was not until this socialist minority protested, on the 16th of May, against the revolutionary dictatorship of Pyat, Rigault, and their fellows, and declared that it would no longer sit in the Hôtel de Ville, that Rigault and Urbain dared, the day after, to propose and have put to vote the law concerning the hostages."

May I add another important citation from the same source? "There were in the revolt of 1871 three distinct phases: it was called forth and executed by the republican element (1) with no other programme than maintenance of the republic; was then made use of and organized by the socialistic element (2), which brought to it the considerable support of the International; it then fell rapidly into the hands of revolutionists properly so called (3). This sad evolution brought into power successively the central committee of

the national guard, the Commune of Paris, and the committee of public safety." *

It must be added, however, that in Paris the International identified itself with the Commune and the revolution against the Assembly at Versailles. One of its best members, Tolain, who, in fact, was one of the founders of the Association, had been chosen a member of the French Assembly and took his seat. The federation or section to which he belonged passed a vote, after the establishment of the Commune, that he should resign his place in the national legislature and adhere to the Commune, or lose his status in the International, thus making opposition to the actual organization of the French state a condition of membership in that body.

3. After the murder of the hostages, the destruction of public buildings, and the attempted burning of the city, the general council at London published a manifesto "to all the members of the Association in Europe and the United States." Their object is to put the best face possible on the transactions during the capture of Paris, and to lay the blame on the soldiers of the government and on M. Thiers. "In war, they say, fire is an entirely righteous weapon. Buildings occupied by an enemy are bombarded only to set

* *La Commune*, pp. 8, 9. By Bourlonton et Robert. Paris, 1872.

them on fire. The Commune used fire, in the strictest sense of the word, as a means of defence." The putting to death of the hostages was the fault of the government at Versailles, who refused to give up Blanqui in exchange for Archbishop Darboy and a large number of clerical and other persons. A strange operation this, to seize upon a large number of innocent men within the town, peaceable persons who had no connection with the enemy outside, and make them hostages for a single man taken in war.

We have no space to dwell on this manifesto further, except to say that by its malignant spirit and useless palliation of crimes on which mankind look with horror, it made them its own. It hurt the cause for which it was written. Two of the council gave up their places on account of it. It gave ground to the French government for the enactment of a law against all who should become members of the International Workingmen's Association, or any other society with similar doctrines, or who should aid and co-operate in spreading its doctrines or letting it have a hall for the purposes of meeting, etc.

The effect of the events at Paris was—whether the impression were true or not—to identify the International with bloody insurrections against established order and to keep it under the inspection of the police in almost every country in Europe. Henceforth it would tend more

and more to become a secret society, and, therefore, would have less efficiency, would dwindle away, would lose principle, and become desperate.

CHAPTER V.

I.

LEADING FEATURES OF THE THEORY OF MARX.

WE have already made the remark that there were two changes in the direction which socialism took after the revolutions in 1848. One of them was, that it became more international, and strove to unite the operatives of Europe in a common movement. The other was, that it made the field of political economy in a greater degree the battleground for the new order of things. We do not mean to say that this branch of social philosophy had not been already used as an armory of weapons against the existing relations of capital and labor; or that the socialists of all countries had previously been entirely isolated in their action; but that these changes of direction are more obvious, and played a more important part after the period indicated than before. The International movement in its first and most active period, down to 1872, we have already considered, and have seen that Marx, with other Germans, had much to do with it. The same emi-

nent socialist gave to the theory and claims of socialism the form which at the present time is most current, especially in Germany. It will be our endeavor to give the leading features of his economic theory, so far as they are necessary for the understanding of the present standpoint of the leading socialists and of their party.

In 1859 Marx gave to the world a small work, entitled "For the Criticism of Political Economy;" and in 1867 an enlargement and continuation of the same, under the title of "Capital: a Critique on Political Economy." The first volume, which is all that has appeared, and which contains only Book First, "The Process of the Production of Capital," appeared first in 1867, and again in 1872, somewhat enlarged, so as to form a volume of 822 pages. The work, written in the dialect of the Hegelian philosophy, with a terminology of its own, is not readily understood, and is more like a production of Thomas Aquinas than like an essay of Cairnes or Roscher. In the preface to the first edition Marx complains that Lassalle, in his work attacking Schulze-Delitzsch, is guilty of seriously misunderstanding it. I must endeavor, with the help of others, to present the simplest outline that I can of the most fundamental points in Marx's work, which rest on no newly discovered truths, but on such as Adam Smith and Ricardo long since made familiar to the students of political economy.

The principal lever of Marx against the present form of industry, and of the distribution of its results, is the doctrine that value—that is, value in exchange—is created by labor alone. Now this value, as ascertained by exchanges in the market or measured by some standard, does not actually all go to the laborer, in the shape of wages. Perhaps a certain number of yards of cotton cloth, for instance, when sold, actually pay for the wages of laborers and leave a surplus, which the employer appropriates. Perhaps six hours of labor *per diem* might enable the laborer to create products enough to support himself and to rear up an average family; but at present he has to work ten hours for his subsistence. Where do the results of the four additional hours go? To the employer, and the capitalist from whom the employer borrows money; or to the employer who also is a capitalist and invests his capital in his works, with a view to a future return. The laborer works, and brings new workmen into the world, who in turn do the same. The tendency of wages being toward an amount just sufficient for the maintenance of the labor, there is no hope for the future class of laborers. Nor can competition or concurrence help the matter. A concurrence of capitalists will tend to reduce wages to the minimum, if other conditions remain as they were before. A concurrence of laborers may raise wages above the living point for a while; but

these fall again, through the stimulus which high wages give to the increase of population. A general fall of profits may lower the price of articles used by laborers; but the effect of this is not to add in the end to the laborer's share. He can live at less expense, it is true, but he will need and will get lower wages. Thus the system of labor and capital is a system of robbery. The capitalist is an "expropriator" who must be "expropriated," as Marx expresses it. A just system can never exist as long as wages are determined by free contract between laborers and employers; that is, as long as the means of carrying on production are in private hands. The only cure for the evils of the present industrial system is the destruction of private property—so far, at least, as it is used in production; and the substitution of the state, or of bodies or districts controlled by the state, for the private owner of the means of production. Instead of a number of classes in society, especially instead of a *bourgeoisie* and a *proletariat*, there must be but one class, which works directly or indirectly for the state, and receives as wages what the state decides to give to them. The state, it is taken for granted, will give in return for hours of labor as much as can be afforded, consistently with the interests of future labor and with the expenses necessary for carrying on the state system itself. Whether wages under this kind of social order will be really

greater than they are now ; whether the amount of comforts and of enjoyments will be increased—these questions we may consider hereafter. We now content ourselves with remarking that the laborer has and can have no effective choice in regard to employment, or amount of wages, or place of abode, if the state is to be the great employer and capitalist. His work must be forced work ; and there must be a return to what is, in substance, the same as mediæval serfdom, when the serf owned no land and worked part of the time to maintain his master and a part of the time to maintain himself.

Marx, if we are not in an error, nowhere shows the injustice of private property ; but, rather, assumes that it is not an institution of natural law. Nor does he expound the steps by which the “expropriator is to be expropriated”—a maxim which would seem to denote restitution of property to its natural owner, and hence, the right of the state to be the supreme owner of all property. When this is assumed, the only way of getting rid of the evils of the present social plan is a wholesale confiscation of private property, or the abolition of the right of inheritance, which would eventually bring about the same result ; or confiscation, not taking effect all at once, so as to pauperize the property-holder, but making him some compensation for a term of years. We have not found any declarations of Marx as to the practical way

of introducing the socialistic state, which is certainly a matter of very vast importance. But to this we shall recur in the sequel.

We had intended to give our readers some idea of the system of Marx and an explanation of his new and most ingeniously contrived technical terms; but the attempt within our limits would be hopeless, and we should reach nothing really original. We shall confine our remarks to the fundamental principle that whatever is exchanged is work put into products. "It is only the *quantum* of socially necessary work," says he, "or the work-time socially necessary for the production of a value in use, which determines its amount of value" (*i. e.*, of its value in exchange). "Wares in which equally great quantities of work are contained, or which can be produced in the same work-time, have, therefore, the same amount of value. The value of a ware has the same proportion to the value of another ware, as the time necessary for the production of the one has to the time necessary for the production of the other."

It is, indeed, true that the same amount of labor incorporated in two "wares" or articles will give them equal value in exchange, so far as the factor of labor comes into the estimate; but it is not true that the amount of labor is the only source of value. It is impossible to count hours' work in different employments as having the same value; or to put difficult or dangerous work by

the side of easy or safe work, as though they ought to be subjected to the same measure; or to give equal rewards to intellectual and artistic work and to that performed by the common operative. Then, again, taste displayed in a production of labor will give it a preference over one where the pattern or mode of execution is clumsy. The same labor may be spent on an ugly calico as on a pretty one; but in no state of society—not even in a socialistic republic—will the ugly one exchange with other commodities on equal terms with the handsome one. In the same way in other cases, supply and demand affect all the objects brought into market, on account of their plenty or scarcity, or on account of their different capacity to gratify some desire of man.

But it is far more to our purpose to remark that the employer is a vital factor in all work which requires time for its completion, which is conducted on a large scale, which requires many hands and careful supervision, and which needs knowledge of the money market, of the labor market, of public taste and public demand. Nor is the employer necessary in the present relations only of the laborer and the employer; but, whatever be the form of society, he or somebody discharging his functions will be found necessary. Some such man could not be dispensed with in the co-operative industry of workmen. One or

more of their number would be required to do those duties which are necessary in order to successful production. And so, if the state shall ever take the place of all other employers and capitalists, it will not fail to need supervisors and agents without number, in procuring, for instance, raw material, in keeping up instruments of production, in paying laborers for their hours' toil, in deciding what will best suit the market, in keeping accounts, in providing for sales.

The importance of the employer is also shown by the fact, common enough, that many who start a manufacturing business fail, because they have not the ability or judgment or knowledge that is requisite for success. No skill or industry of the operatives themselves can render the employer useless, and it is on his ability or want of ability that everything depends. If he is not a capitalist, he must, also, provide funds by borrowing from some capitalist for the raw material and for the wages, which are paid before the products are finished and ready for sale. He must establish connections with men who can sell the products; he must be able to judge what products it is most advantageous to manufacture; he must thus calculate well the future probabilities as to quantity and kind of products; his taste and judgment, to a great extent, makes products salable;—he must, in short, be a far-seeing man, with a general's ability to dispose of all the parts of his army, so

that they shall support one another. He, finally, takes all risks upon himself, while the operatives are generally sure of their wages.

Now, the question is: Can or should the man on whom so much depends be thrown out of calculation and treated as of no account? Is it not for the interests of all that he should have a considerable share—if the year's work turns out well—in the proceeds of the articles which he, in fact, has greatly contributed to create? And will not, for the most part, his profits go to the benefit of labor, and by accumulation of profits, cheapen the prices of all commodities, and in the end benefit the entire community, laborers and others? This is but a balance against the risks and losses to which employers and capitalists are subject, and which are disastrous to laborers, although they receive their full amount of wages.

The measure of remuneration for work is time, according to Marx's system. The differences of influence upon the amount produced by skilled and unskilled, efficient and inefficient work, by a capacity to meet the ends for which a particular industry is set on foot, and by labor little above brute force, are not estimated. Work is work, and all who work an hour are paid alike. The treatment of the superintendent is in conformity with this kind of equalization. If he is fit for the business, his management alone meets the ends of united industry in a special form. But if he

is the pivot on which everything turns, he ought in justice to be rewarded for the success of the undertaking, unless we lay it down that the end of labor is to support life, and no one has a claim to anything more.

To this might be added, that the amount of remuneration to the capitalist and employer is a small portion of the whole product obtained by the joint agency of capital and labor. Mr. Edward Atkinson, a most competent judge, says that "in the first division those who do the actual work of production, either of the raw material or of the finished article, must get ninety-five to ninety-seven parts, and the owner of capital only three to five." And from these three to five parts taxes and private expenses must be drawn. And Mr. Mill, in the chapter on Socialism, recently published, remarks that the remuneration of capital, as such, in Great Britain, is measured by the interest on the funds, which is about three and one-third per cent. All above this is to be referred to the employer's wages of superintendence, to various risks, and other causes.

If there were any other plan which could bring more wages to operatives and more prosperity to all parts of society, let it be by all means tried at once. Suppose that all the profits were paid over to the operatives; would that mitigate any of the evils of society? By no means. On the contrary, all capital would be withdrawn from active

use, for no employers would work and undergo risks for nothing.

We come, then, to the conclusion that work has no just claim to the entire results of production. How much of those results shall it appropriate? Does justice or the good of society demand that it shall have an amount which may be equal to the supply of the laborers' necessities; or ought it to be more, ought it to be very much more? Prof. Cairnes says that he is "unaware of any rule of justice applicable to the problem of distributing the produce of industry," and that "any attempt to give effect to what are considered the dictates of justice which should involve, as a means toward that end, a disturbance of the fundamental assumptions on which economic reasoning is based—especially those of the right of private property and the freedom of individual industry—would, in [his] opinion, putting all other than material considerations aside, be inevitably followed by the destruction or indefinite curtailment of the fund itself from which the remuneration of all classes is derived."

Some of the workingmen in Germany, who have been led to embrace socialistic views, seem to expect that in the new socialistic world of the future all the returns from labor will go to the laborer; for instance, that a year's production of cotton cloth, consisting of fifty million yards, at ten cents the yard, or \$5,000,000, would have no

deductions made from it by the new employer—the state. But this is as far as possible from the truth, unless the state can provide raw material, machinery, and buildings, and do all the work which an employer now does, from some other fund. Nor is this all; for the state must provide for its own proper expenses as a political body, besides those incurred in its capacity of an employer, out of the avails of the workingman's industry. It would be possible, indeed, to pay all alike for work-time, to put the employer or supervisor and the most unskilled workmen on the same level, laying out of the account capacity and the importance of operations. Whether in practice this would work well or ill, there can be but one opinion.

II.

FERDINAND LASSALLE AND THE GERMAN WORKINGMEN'S UNION.

MARX and Lassalle were the two leaders in the German socialistic movement; but the former became a cosmopolite in his principles, while the other was a German to the end of his career. They differed widely in their characteristics. Marx is cold and bitter. He is more of a philosopher than of an orator; he has not figured so much in congresses and public debates as in laying plans for spreading social doctrines. Lassalle

was an ardent and ambitious, as well as a pleasure-loving man; was fond of admiration, and knew how to draw to himself the warm sympathies of the people. Marx went as far as the principles and logic of his socialism could carry him. Lassalle went half way in his socialistic efforts; laying down principles which in the hands of others might overturn society, but aiming in his own efforts at no direct results, and planting the seeds of thought in the future, as if the triumph of his ideas were a great way off. In political economy he was by no means as strong as Marx; but in historical and juristic science was much his superior. He was, indeed, a man of splendid endowments, and only needed self-control to make one of the most eminent jurists or scholars of his native land. But he was driven by contrary forces, so that he fell short of what he could have accomplished in any one direction; and his end disclosed his weakness. A man who is at once a scholar, an orator, and a man of pleasure, cannot do much that will last. Yet his high endowments, his almost sovereign position at the head of his party, and his qualities which gave him power over common men, made him the idol of one party among the German socialists, while he was undervalued and disliked by the other.

Lassalle was born in Breslau, in 1825, the son of a rich Jewish merchant, who destined him for the same employment; but, preferring a life of

study, he betook himself to the university, where he pursued philosophy and law. At Berlin, where he intended to settle as a private teacher, he awakened the highest admiration of William von Humboldt and Boeckh. Heinrich Heine, whom he saw at Paris, in 1845, introduced him to Varnhagen von Ense, in these terms: "He is a young man of the most distinguished endowments, with the most thorough learning, the most extensive knowledge, the greatest acuteness that have ever come under my notice. To the richest power of expression he unites an energy of will and a skill in action which astonish me." To this he adds that "Lassalle is a genuine son of the modern time, which will have nothing to do with self-restraint and discretion."

Lassalle's life was diverted from its original purpose by an acquaintance, in 1845, with the Countess of Hatzfeld, a Berlin beauty, forty years old, who was then involved in a suit for divorce against her husband. He took her part as her counsel, and spent the best portion of eight years in carrying the case to a successful issue. In 1846 he managed to get possession of a casket containing documents important for his client, and was tried for moral complicity in a theft; but was acquitted, on the ground that the theft was not foreseen by him but originated among the servants of the countess. This suit led to lasting intimacy between the parties. He received—as

F. Mehring, in his "Social Democracy," says—a yearly income of five thousand thalers from the lady.

Lassalle entered into his relations with the countess in real sympathy; and he said, a little before his death, in a letter to Huber, that his intervention in her affairs was the fact in his life of which he should ever continue to be proud. But they brought him into a circle which his critics call impure (*"unsauber"*), and he, therefore, comes before the world in no *favorable* light. "Is there," asks an eminent German, von Treitschke, "abjectness more vulgar than demagoguery over truffles and champagne; than the carousing and unchaste life of an adventurer, which was led by this man who played the part of the saviour of the suffering? Even in France good society would, without mercy, have rejected every one who took part in the elegant gypsy life of the Hatzfeld circle. Only we Germans, with our incomplete social ethics, are more tolerant."

Until the spring of 1848 Lassalle lived at Düsseldorf. Here he took part in movements which brought him into connection with Marx, Engels, and other social leaders; and in the revolutionary year, 1848, was unsuccessfully accused of inciting the people to armed violence. He was, although not convicted, held under arrest, and was subsequently sentenced, for a very trifling offence, to six months' imprisonment. In 1849, having now

completed the law-suit of the Countess of Hatzfeld, he returned in disguise to Berlin, and ere long obtained leave, through Wm. von Humboldt, to remain in that city. In the same year he published a work, which he had written some time before, entitled "The Philosophy of Heraclitus the Obscure, of Ephesus," of which Ueberweg says that "it is the most thorough monograph on the subject, but that the author is at times too much given to Hegelianizing." In the ensuing years appeared his rhetorical drama, entitled "Francis of Sickingen," "The Italian War and the Task of Prussia" (1859), "Fichte's Political Legacy" (1860), with "The Philosophy of Fichte and the Meaning of the Spirit of the German People" (1862). These last-mentioned works were written to propagate his idea of a centralized German democracy. In 1861 he published his "System of Acquired Rights," in two volumes, the object of which was to show that certain rights of vast importance—such as property and inheritance—are really historical, and not jural; that is, that they arose in circumstances which justified their recognition, but that certain other circumstances might require their abolition. The second volume is occupied with the question of inheritance. This is a very learned attack on the present constitution of society, and an argument to prove that a social state may have a right to exist. In this work he already caught up the

doctrine of Marx, first announced in his "Critique of Political Economy" (1859), that the value of work acquired in production must wholly belong to the workman.

A little after the publication of this work Lassalle delivered a lecture, which was published under the title of "The Workingmen's Programme," on the special connection of the present period of history with the idea of the laboring class. The object of this was to show the rise and growth of the classes that lay outside of feudalism, from the feudal times until the present. The political condition and importance in society of these classes has been growing until now. First the *bourgeoisie* and the men of capital emerged from the insignificance they had in the feudal ages. Then the laboring class, rescued from serfdom, began to claim power and the reform of social evils. We are at this point of a progress which must of necessity go onward by revolution or reform.

In May, 1863, Lassalle founded the German "Workingmen's Union," which was somewhat more than a year older than the International. Its object confined it to the States of the German Confederation, and it arose "out of the conviction that only by general, equal, and direct suffrage a satisfactory representation of the social interests of the German operative class can be brought about," etc. Lassalle was to preside over this Union for

five years with almost autocratic power—subject, indeed, to a committee or council, but to one scattered over Germany, which could seldom be brought together. This post he filled with an energy and a consumption of vital force that few, if any, agitators have equalled. His writings from this period until his death were devoted to social questions. His speeches and addresses were numerous. The working class heard him gladly. He effected a separation between the socialists of his party and those persons who looked for relief to the plans suggested by the Progressive Party, as it was called; or, in other words, he detached the workingmen from the *bourgeoisie*, or third estate. But his success was by no means as great as he hoped for. The vital power of the movement was concentrated in the head, and could not be sufficiently diffused through the members. The International continually asked, in its numberless meetings, local and general: “What shall we do?” They had definite aims; but Lassalle’s organization did little more than convoke men to listen to a powerful and eloquent chief. His position, again, which confined the Union to Germany, making it simply national, was a false one. As another remarks, socialism, as such, is universal; and, if it is the true remedy for social evils, it ought to be proclaimed everywhere. The Union, again, by means of personal rivalries, was brought into a false relation toward the Interna-

tional. They could not unite and they could not both thrive in Germany. Finally, when universal suffrage was introduced into the North German Confederation, in 1867, the main object for which the Union was founded was accomplished; for its objects, or the objects of the party represented by it, could be either attained in the Reichstag, through its representatives there, or something, beyond that which was contemplated in the existing organization, must be sought for. It is not strange, then, that the small fruits of his agitation were extremely disheartening to Lassalle.

His discouragement appears strikingly in an extract from a letter written in the last year of his life:

“New supplies of money I cannot get; and just as little can I let the Union go to the ground as long as hope beckons to me in the political heaven. . . . I am deadly weary; and, strong as my constitution is, it trembles to the very marrow. My excitement is so great that I can no longer sleep by night. I roll about until five o'clock, and arise with headache, utterly exhausted. I am overworked, overstrained, over-wearied to a fearful degree. The mad effort to complete the ‘Bastiat-Schulze’ [one of his latest works against Mr. Schulze von Delitzsch, leader of the Progressive Party], besides everything else, in three months, the deep and painful discovery of my delusion, the gnawing internal vexation with which the indifference and apathy of the working class, taken as a whole, fills me, are together too much even for me.”

In the summer of 1864 he attended the festival of the foundation of the Union, which was

celebrated in Rhenish Prussia. Here he was received by the workingmen with tumultuous applause. Next he visited several watering-places of Germany and Switzerland. His death was due to his unregulated mind, which gave itself up to pride and passion. He had become enamored of a young lady in Munich, who rejected his addresses, preferring another man. Lassalle challenged his rival, and was shot dead by him, August 31, 1864.

No one can scruple to call Lassalle a socialist in the sense of that word which implies a denial of the right of private individual property and a desire to make the working class the only order in the state. But he did not express his views very clearly, and had no plans of immediate change in the institutions of society. His policy was to agitate; to set the minds of the laboring class at work in preparation for a mild and peaceful overturning in the future. One of his plans, which is not absolutely socialistic, was the founding of productive associations, which differed from Louis Blanc's workshops mainly in this,—that they were not got up by the state, but by unions of operatives, on the credit of the state. There was also an insurance union embraced in the project, for the purpose of making up local losses of the associations by the help of profits elsewhere made. The managers of the several productive associations in every place were to pay weekly

wages to the laborers, and would be united together in one vast union. That this plan was practicable and could be extremely lucrative "could be denied," he says, "only by the ignorance to which it is unknown that both in England and in France numerous workingmen's associations subsist, which depend entirely on the efforts of the isolated laborers who belong to them, and yet have reached a high degree of prosperity." We believe that this device is altogether discarded by the most advanced socialists.

Lassalle made more of the "iron law" of wages in his agitations than of any other single doctrine of political economy. He explains it thus: "The iron economical law, which in existing relations, under the control of supply and demand for work, determines the wages of work, is this: that the average wages always continue reduced to the means of living which are required in a nation, according to the usages there prevailing, for perpetuating existence and propagating children." There is nothing to complain of in this statement of the law, except first that wages are generally above the sum necessary for supporting and supplying labor—that is, are above the minimum; and that more has been paid on the average is shown by strikes and savings-banks, by the great contributions to trades-unions, and the vast sums spent for useless or hurtful drinks. But, again, is he not in a great error when he imputes this "iron

law" to the relations in society as it now exists, to supply and demand, and free contract between laborer and employer? Must it not be called a law of nature, inevitably growing out of the incitements to the increase of population in the working class? Ricardo's doctrine of wages was founded on the law of population, as interpreted by Malthus. As far as we can see, it might just as much affect a society where the government was the sole employer and capitalist, as it affects a society where free contract and wages paid by the employer are in vogue. A high remuneration paid by the state to all its laborers—that is, to the whole population of the social state—would encourage population just as high wages do now. And there is this advantage on the side of present usage, that now the laborer feels some responsibility for rearing a family; but then he would lean wholly on the state. This could be prevented only by the despotical act, on the state's part, of making marriage a crime, if contracted without the state's license, or by preventing it in some other way.

III.

SOCIALISM IN GERMANY SINCE LASSALLE.

After Lassalle's death the election of persons of much less importance to the office of president of the Workingmen's Union, and the in-

trigues of the Countess of Hatzfeld, by which the members of the Union were divided into two factions, retarded its progress; but the choice of Alexander Schweitzer, in 1867, brought back a hope of prosperity. He was from Frankfort, had studied law, and was editor of the *Social Democrat*, the organ of the Union. Mehring, in his "German Social Democracy," calls him "a voluptuary, full of *esprit*, who was too prudent and of too strong a character to waste himself wholly in sensual pleasure." He had, during his five years of official connection with the Union, enemies within and without its pale. The friends of the International in Germany felt that their time was come to unite all the socialists of that race under one banner. They professed to suspect him of being in secret understanding with the government of Prussia; and his political views, favoring the centralization which was effected in 1867, were diametrically opposite to those of German Internationalists, such as Liebknecht and Bebel. This faction first managed to alter the constitution of the Union, so as to *abridge* the power of its president; but when Schweitzer persuaded the members to put things in their old place again, and effected a junction with the Hatzfeld faction, a new organization, outside of the Union and antagonistic to it, was felt to be necessary. At a general assembly Liebknecht declared that Schweitzer must be got rid

of, as one who was seeking, in the interests of the Prussian government, to prevent united action among the workingmen. In a congress summoned by the International party, and to which the members of the Union were invited, after violent disputes, the "Social Democratic Workingmen's Party" was founded by Liebknecht and his friends, in August, 1869. In the other organization Schweitzer held his own for several years. One of his plans was to build up a general system of trades-unions, and thus to encourage strikes. These differed from Lassalle's productive associations in this, that they could act under the existing conditions of industry. Strikes were not promoted as directly favoring socialistic changes, which they could not effect; but as calculated to awaken the class feeling of operatives, and as helping to do away with some of the existing grievances. But strikes met with encouragement also from the Party of Progress, which had no social leanings and considered private capital necessary, yet on humane principles strove to meliorate the condition of the working class.

In 1871 Schweitzer failed of being re-elected to the office of president of the Union, and was succeeded by a man named Hasenclever. Its prosperity after this depended much on its journal, the new *Social Democrat*.

The programme of the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party, constituted at Eisenach, in

1869, seems to have been shrewdly intended to be so indefinite, and to have such a squint toward the two opposing parties, that it could succeed in detaching numbers of adherents of Lassalle from their old faith without their being aware that they were deserting their colors. Some of the principles, which every member of this party binds himself to accept, are "equal rights and equal duties of all, and the doing away of all class supremacy;" the getting rid of the present method of production (by means of wages), and the securing, by means of associated work, to each laborer of the full returns of his labor. On the ground that the social question cannot be separated from the political, they aim at its solution in the democratic state, where alone it is possible. "In view of the fact that the freedom of work is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, which embraces all lands where modern society exists, the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party considers itself, so far as the laws of the [North German] Union allow, to be a branch of the International Workingmen's Association, to the plans and efforts of which it gives its adhesion."

The immediate demands to be put forward in the "agitation" carried on by the party are such as these: (1.) The universal, equal, direct, and secret right to election of all men twenty years old into the parliament, the diets of the single

states, the provincial and communal assemblies, as well as into all other representative bodies. To the representatives thus elected sufficient pay is to be allowed. (2.) Introduction of direct legislation by the people—that is, the right of proposing laws and of rejecting laws passed by legislatures. (3.) Abolition of all privileges of rank, birth, and confession. (4.) The institution of a militia, instead of the standing army. (5.) Separation of the church from the state, and of the school from the church. (6.) Obligatory instruction in common schools, and gratuitous instruction in all public institutions for polite education. (7.) Independence of courts, introduction of juries, of courts composed of experts, of public and oral judicial proceedings, and of gratuitous administration of justice. (8.) Abolition of all laws relating to the press, to unions, and coalitions; the definition of a normal day's work; limitation of the amount of work done by women; and prohibition of the work of children. (9.) Abolition of all indirect taxes, and introduction of a single direct, progressive income tax and inheritance tax. (10.) Help from the state to associations (of laborers), and the state's credit for free productive associations under democratic guarantees.

This last demand was, without doubt, inserted to please the followers of Lassalle, and could not have been acceptable to the Internationalists of

the party. Many of the others are reasonable and just. That under No. 9 throws the burden of taxation on the rich, and could be used for the purpose of taxing inheritances to such a degree that they would fall to the state. The International was approved of to suit the views of the majority in the party; but it was not altogether safe to declare the new association a branch of it, and hence the qualifying clause, "as far as the laws of the Union allow." An unqualified connection might become dangerous. The social nucleus of the whole programme lies in the declaration that the party strives to abolish the present method of production, and to secure to the workmen the full returns or yield of their labor. If this means, as it seems to mean, that the entire gross product ought to go to the laborer, it would be as absurd and impossible when the government should become the sole capitalist as it would be now. They can hardly intend to say that industry ought to be co-operative, and to keep the entire returns of labor as its reward, the laborers thus taking the place of the capitalist.

In the Reichstag, or Parliament of the North German Confederation, and, after 1871, in that of United Germany, the two socialistic parties were represented by a few of their leading members. By having common enemies to contend with, they were led to overlook their less important differences and to live in peace. The govern-

ment of Prussia, also, by its persecution, first of members of the Workingmen's Union and then of the Workingmen's Party, brought them nearer to one another. Their differences, after the passage of the Eisenach programme, were more owing to differences of organization than to differences of opinion. At length a plan of union was agreed upon by the principal men of the two associations, and accepted at Gotha, in May, 1875, by the representatives there present. These represented 15,000 paying members of the Lassalleans, or Workingmen's Union, and 9,000 of the others; which shows that the former, after all their disasters, following the death of Lassalle, were still the more numerous organization in Germany. The acceptance of the Gotha programme virtually extinguished the older party. Lassalle was defeated, and the principles of the International were now to be predominant in Germany, notwithstanding its decline in the rest of Europe after the events of 1871 in Paris.

The programme of Gotha differs from that of Eisenach not by introducing any new principle, but by being somewhat more positive and explicit. It begins with declaring that "work is the source of all wealth and all culture; and that, as work which is generally useful is only possible by means of society, the entire product of work belongs to society, that is, to all its members,—with an obligation to work common to all accord-

ing to equal right,—to every one according to his reasonable wants.”

“In the society of the present the instruments of work are a monopoly of the class of capitalists. The dependence of the working class, which is due to this, is the cause of misery and servitude in all its forms.”

“The liberation of work requires that the means of production be converted into the common property of society, and that there be an associational regulation of the sum total of work, with application of its results to the general use and a just distribution of its returns.”

“The liberation of work must be effected by the working class, which, over against all other classes, are only a reactionary mass.”

“Proceeding from these principles, the Socialistic Workingmen’s Party of Germany, by all legal means, strives for the free state and the socialistic society; for the breaking in pieces of the iron law of wages, by doing away with the system of working for wages; by putting an end to making gain out of others; by the removal of all social and political inequality.”

“The Socialistic Workingmen’s Party of Germany, although directly acting within national limits, is aware of the international character of the workingmen’s movement, and is resolved to fulfil all the duties thus laid on workingmen, in order to make the brotherhood of all men a reality.”

Then it is added, for the purpose of pleasing Lassalle's followers, that, "in order to pave the way to a solution of the social question," the party "demands the setting up of socialistic productive associations, to be assisted by the states and under the democratic control of the working people." These associations are to be called into life for [manufacturing] industry and for agriculture to such an extent that out of them the socialistic organization of the sum total of work may arise.

The programme then sets forth certain points as foundations of the state, and makes certain demands for reform within the existing order of the state, which are not materially different from those of the Eisenach programme.

The first paragraph of the declaration made at Gotha is open to more than one objection. Mehring, in his "*Deutsche Socialdemocratie*," criticises the expression, "to every one according to his reasonable wants." What does this vague phrase mean, and who is to be judge in the case? So of righteous division of the proceeds of labor he says that this is what every society which has life in it regards as its duty. He adds that "an authentic interpretation of the canon of the party was represented as to be expected," which, however, until now (1877) has not seen the light. "After a careful study of their literature, one can only say that the leaders of the movement have

decidedly different views respecting the meaning and comprehensiveness of the party programme."

The very beginning of the programme seems to be altogether illogical and inconsequent. "Work is the source of all riches and culture. Work, having a general value, is only possible in and through society. Therefore, the sum total of work belongs to society—that is, to all its members." Such are the fundamental propositions. But is it not possible to conceive of an individual in a society making something that everybody else will be glad to have—a chair, for instance—without its belonging to society? If so, does not the proposition beg the question that there is no such thing as private property?

Even before the meeting at Gotha, where these articles were accepted, the socialistic movement began to make steady progress. At least, the increase of votes given to the candidates of this party for seats in the Reichstag can be interpreted on no other supposition. In the first Reichstag after the formation of the German Empire there were but two socialist members. In the second (1874) there were nine, for whom 339,738 votes were cast. Von Treitschke estimates that the whole strength of the party or factions, counting men, and youths too young to vote, may have then been about a million. The vote of 1877, when a new parliament was chosen, amounted, according to Mr. Bancroft Davis (in his correspon-

dence with the Department of State) to from six to eight hundred thousand. Recent evidences of political fanaticism, leading to the greatest crimes, may retard this progress for a time; but it does not yet seem to have reached the highest flood tide. It is, however, quite probable that many vote for representatives of socialism who know little about its principles, either out of hatred to Prussia or for some other extraneous cause. The party at present has no concentrated strength; but consists chiefly of a large number of minorities and of a few masses which control their election districts.

The zeal of the German socialists in their cause is shown by two facts: one of which is that more than a hundred and fifty agitators—trained and schooled, and either drawing a full or partial salary for their services or working out of love to the cause,—can be said to be in the employment of the Workingmen's Party. The other fact is their activity in spreading their doctrine through the press. The central organ has 12,000 subscribers. Besides this, they have forty-one political sheets, one literary paper with a socialistic tone, and fourteen organs of trades-unions. Twenty-eight are printed by presses which socialists have founded, of which fourteen exist at present (Mehring).

Another sign of the growth of the Social Democratic Party is the fact that a number of profes-

sors in the universities who lecture on political economy—although they have not joined its ranks, and in some instances, at least, reject its leading doctrines—give to it in a certain sense the hand of fellowship. They go by the name of *Kathedersocialisten* (or socialists in the professor's chair), and have formed a union at Eisenach for "social politics." Among them are names well known to students in their science. Mehring (in his "Social Democracy") includes among them, as belonging to a school with leanings toward socialism in the widest sense, Brentano, Scheel, Schmoller, Adolf Wagner; in a narrower sense, Rodbertus, Schaeffle, F. A. Lange, and Dühring. "This scientific socialism," he adds, "distinguishes itself by an uncommon number of interesting characters; but this advantage has a reverse side, in an entire want of agreement both as to their criticism of the present order of society and as to their positive demands. They have not made any lasting impression on the workingmen's movement. But it is scientific socialism which to-day fills all patriotic hearts with anxiety."

One of these learned men has written a little work, entitled the "Quintessence of Socialism," of which I propose to speak in the next chapter.

APPENDIX

on Mr. J. S. Mill's chapters on socialism, written in 1869, and published in the present year, 1879, in the *Fortnightly Review*.

When Mr. Mill wrote the chapter on property, in his Political Economy, of which two sections are devoted to Communism and to St. Simonism and Fourierism, the problems touching labor and capital had only begun to be politically and socially important. In 1869 he formed a design of writing a book on the great social question, which was now showing the hold it was taking on the minds of philosophers and workingmen in various ways, especially by the progress of the International. Of this book only four chapters in their "first rough drafts" seem to have been composed. I give a very brief sketch of them here, the present work having already been written when they were first printed.

Mr. Mill, after noticing the demands of workingmen in Great Britain, such as that wages should not depend on free contract, that "usury" should be abolished, and that land should not be private property, passes on to speak very briefly of the position taken by the same class on the Continent—a position which has been sufficiently explained in the text of this work. The great evils, of which socialists complain, are poverty,

“little connected with individual deserts,” and competition. To competition of laborers, low wages are due; to competition among producers, ruin and bankruptcy. Both these evils tend to increase with the increase of population; and none are benefited but landholders, capitalists, and receivers of fixed money incomes. Wealth enables its owners to undersell all other producers, and to engross the labor of a country, subjecting the workmen to such terms of payment for labor as the employers offer. Mr. Mill fortifies his assertions regarding the attacks of the socialists on the existing order of things by extensive quotations from Victor Considérant, the Fourierite, Robert Owen, and Louis Blanc.

He next examines the socialist objections to the present order of society; one of which is that wages are low, and tend to fall still more. This assertion, he says, “is in opposition to all accurate information and to many notorious facts. It has yet to be proved that there is any country of the civilized world, where the ordinary wages of labor, estimated either in money or in articles of consumption, are declining; while in many they are, upon the whole, on the increase—an increase which is becoming not slower but more rapid. The exceptions are temporary and confined to certain branches of industry which are becoming superseded by others.”

The socialists, especially M. Louis Blanc, Mr.

Mill goes on to say, seem to have fallen into the error, which Malthus at first committed, "of supposing that, because population has a greater power of increase than subsistence, *its pressure upon subsistence must be always growing more severe.*" "The tendency to over-population is a fact which communism, as well as the existing order of society, would have to deal with." "Experience shows that in the existing state of society the pressure of population on subsistence, which is the principal cause of low wages, though a great, is not an increasing evil." And the progress of civilization has a tendency to diminish it by a more rapid increase of the means of employing labor, by opening new countries to laborers, and by improving the intelligence and prudence of a people. It is, however, of course an open question what form of society has the greatest power of dealing successfully with the pressure of population on subsistence.

Mr. Mill next remarks that even the most enlightened socialists have *an imperfect and one-sided notion of the workings of competition.* "They forget that it is the cause of high as well as of low prices and values;" the buyers of labor and of commodities compete with one another, as well as the sellers. When it is perfectly free on both sides, its tendency is to equalize, not to raise or lower, the prices of articles; to level inequalities of remuneration, and to reduce all to a gen-

eral average. And, particularly, if it keeps down the price of articles on which wages are expended, this is to the great advantage of those who depend on wages [when they are considered simply as consumers]. Mr. Louis Blanc, and other socialists, affirm that low prices produced by competition are delusive, as leading to higher prices than before, and finally to the command of the market by the richest competitor. But the commonest experience, says Mr. Mill, shows that this state of things is wholly imaginary. No "important branch of industry or commerce, formerly divided among many, has become, or shows any tendency to become, the monopoly of a few." [But do not many smaller branches show it, and might not a combination of the strongest in important branches break down the rest?] Great joint-stock companies can keep up prices, and "some businesses pass out of the hands of smaller producers into fewer large ones; but when they do this, prices are lowered by the saving of cost."

Competition, however, if a security for lower prices, is by no means a security for quality. On this point socialists have made out the existence of a great and growing evil. This evil Mr. Mill thinks to be capable of cure by laws against frauds of adulteration, and by coöperative purchase from the wholesale merchants.

Another misapprehension of socialists relates

to the share of the product taken by others besides those who are directly engaged in the labor of production. "As long as a man derives an income from his capital, he has not the option of withholding it from the use of others." This income from capital is measured by interest, and interest apart from risk is in England about three and a third per cent. If a man were "to give up the whole of this to his laborers, who already share among them the whole of his capital, as it is annually reproduced, the addition to their weekly wages would be inconsiderable. Of what he obtains beyond three per cent" [Mr. Mill takes off one-third of one per cent. for risk], "a great part is insurance against the manifold losses to which he is exposed, and cannot be safely applied to his own use, but requires to be kept in reserve to cover those losses, when they recur. The remainder is properly the remuneration of his skill and industry—the wages of his labor of superintendence."

"The present system," Mr. Mill continues, "is not, as many socialists believe, hurrying us into a state of general indigence and slavery; on the contrary, the general tendency is toward the slow diminution" of existing evils.

The author next passes on to the subject of the difficulties of socialism, making the natural distinction between small communistic societies (distributed over an entire country, if the system

should succeed), and the management of the whole productive industry of a state by the general government. The second (which is now the only plan of socializing society that is advocated) has, he thinks, all the difficulties which attend on the first and many more. The *first* has the advantage that it can be brought into operation by degrees. The second, which must resort to force if necessary, requires in those who would support it both "a serene confidence in their own wisdom and a recklessness of other people's sufferings, which Robespierre and St. Just scarcely came up to." Yet "it has great elements of popularity which the more cautious form of socialism has not, because what it professes to do it promises to do quickly." Mr. Mill next considers the motives to exertion which would naturally exist in both these forms of socialistic life, and comes to the conclusion that they have no advantage, as far as the general body is concerned, while as respects the managing heads it is placed at a considerable disadvantage. [It is implied in this conclusion that the manager is chosen by the community, that he receives no especial remuneration above others, and that all work has the same wages. As these conditions need not exist in small, voluntary communities, like those which have been considered in our second chapter, and as the very contrast to, and separation from the outside world, which such societies present, may be a

motive of some power, his remarks do not fully apply to this kind of communities. Nor, again, do they necessarily apply to socialistic states, where the central power might, and probably would, appoint all the managers and agents engaged in production and distribution. These would thus be government officers, naturally under the supervision of higher authorities, and able to supervise the workingmen.] The motives, however, under communism, as Mr. Mill urges, in doing honest and efficient work, would be no stronger than those which now act on laborers ; and the principle of paying all workers and kinds of work alike, which seems to be necessary in socialistic production, may be in part superseded under the present form of industry [as by piece-work, by dismissing, or rewarding, on a lower scale, the lazy or incompetent, by special rewards, like that of admitting the faithful or skilful to a share of the profits].

Another just criticism of the author is, that as private life in communistic associations would be brought in a most unexampled degree under the dominion of public authority, there would be less scope for the development of individual character and individual preferences, than has hitherto existed among the full citizens of any state, belonging to the progressive branches of the human family.

Yet Mr. Mill does "not seek to draw any in-

ference against the possibility that communistic production is capable, at some future time, of being the form of society best adapted to the wants and circumstances of mankind." "The various schemes for managing the productive resources of the country by public, instead of private agency have a case for trial, and some of them may eventually establish their claims to preference over the existing order of things; but they are at present workable only by the *élite* of mankind, and have yet to prove their power of training mankind at large to the state of improvement which they presuppose." [If they should turn out to establish their claims by and by, the utilitarian school of philosophers would find no difficulty in sacrificing the institution of property to the new Leviathan.]

CHAPTER VI.

I.

SCHAEFFLE'S "QUINTESSENCE OF SOCIALISM."

THIS short work of 69 pages aims to give a condensed account of what modern, especially German, socialism is in its leading principles, and of its consequences in a politico-economical respect. The author, who is an able and leading political economist of Southwestern Germany, shows a dispassionate, impartial spirit; although one cannot help getting the impression that he is not decidedly averse to the movement which he describes. In the preface to his second edition he expresses the opinion that "the wealthy and cultivated classes are, at least, as much interested in the thorough improvement of the politico-economical organization of society as the proletarians are;" and that in the restless, feverish struggles and uncertain issues of modern industrial acquisitiveness "families of wealth are not sure whether they may not, in the next or in the third generation, themselves sink to the proletarian condition. They especially are threatened in

their estates and family life by the existing state of things."

Sounding thus a note of alarm, as if he would open the eyes of all to a new order of society in prospect, or, at least, possible, he asks, as his first question, what socialism is, and defines it as the substitution of "collective" capital for private capital; that is, of the collective property of the community in the means of production. The collective organization of rational work would set aside all concurrence, all competition, by putting the production and the distribution of all products under official direction, either immediately or indirectly under the control of the state.

For this end the sum of the needed supplies of every product must be fixed by a current official estimate of the required necessities, made by authorities having to do with the production and disposal of commodities; and such data must lie at the foundation of the social plan of industry. The occasional deficiencies or excesses of objects produced, as compared with the wants or demands of every period, would need to be periodically balanced by means of supplies laid up in public storehouses.

It is plain that some such starting-point is necessary in the system. But it is not equally plain that to meet wants in this way would be as efficient as the present plan, that of acting through the energy of individual persons and through pri-

vate, separate capital. Those who are familiar with Whately's beautiful discussion,—in which the supplies of the wants of London, through a series of public officers, are compared with similar supplies through private dealers, each having his own beat and being familiar with its necessities,—will doubt whether free individual interest would not do the work which it does now, better than combined and, to a degree, enforced work. So that, unless the evils of the present system at some other point do not greatly overbalance its benefits, we must start with the impression that German socialism would from the first have a load greater than it could carry.

On this plan in all operations of business, and, indeed, in all operations, the state, and the state alone, produces whatever is produced, and provides, in the system of production, for a supply of whatever is consumed. A departure this the widest possible from the present system of private work and private capital. "The reader," says Mr. Schaeffle, "who has never concerned himself particularly with this revolutionary plan of organization, will scarcely comprehend it. We ourselves have spent years in getting to the bottom of it. And yet this plan has already a party on its side, which, owing to its hot zeal, its enthusiasm and a faith that removes mountains, to its compact organization and international diffusion, takes the lead of many other great parties, con-

stantly gains proselytes, and looks with the assurance of victory toward the future." "It is, indeed, true that the leaders among the German socialists are perfectly aware that the agitation for the new collective order of things is in its beginnings; that the present system of production must root out small proprietors, and well-nigh complete the plutocratic process of separating the people into a proletarian multitude and a few over-grown millionaires, before the masses, especially the country population and the small citizens, will or can assent to the principle of 'collectivism.' At such an early stage of the progress of a movement reserve in making known a positive programme is not at all striking. All prudent leaders of parties have, at a like stage of their agitation, done the same."

This caution, we may remark, is obviously necessary, for a detailed plan might contain particulars which would make its execution impossible or vastly enhance its difficulties. But, on the other hand, if society is to be overturned from its foundations, men will insist on seeing that utter ruin does not stare them in the face; that a new order of things is practicable; that it involves far fewer evils than those which cling to the society of the present. To form such judgments, they must know more than that certain philosophers or partisans think that all will go right in the future.

Although the socialists forbear to go into particulars which do not flow out of their original and essential idea, they claim that time is working with them in their movements. The days when the workman was the proprietor of his machines and products, the days of home-work and cotton-looms, have given way to vast engines and vast manufactories; but the laborers, crowded in enormous establishments, are schooled and concentrated as a politico-social force. And so, although the state's concentration of work, by the mechanism of general military service, is not approved of by the leaders of the *proletariat*; it is not looked upon as an obstacle in their way. The army serves as a school, which in the long run is far from being dangerous to socialism, which drills its soldiers of the future, while it makes the nations hostile on financial accounts to their rulers. Everything that measures off the masses as a separate whole, that includes in itself a public union of individual forces on a vast scale, has a close resemblance, in one respect, at least, to socialism. Thus bayonets and centralization are not safe reliances for existing social order, since socialism may be forced to use them, and can use them most effectively, for its own political purposes.

"The Alpha and Omega of socialism is the transmutation of private competing capital into united collective capital." In regard to the time

when this great change will be effected the leaders of the socialists entertain no sanguine hopes. The means used in the hope of effecting it are obvious enough. Some of them, such as the spread of productive associations, are not in reality conformed to the social theory, but find their object in bringing the operatives together. Others are methods of agitation, derived from the theories of Marx in regard to capital and surplus value. Mr. Schaeffle takes pains to show that, when this agitation reaches even the charge of theft made against capital itself, it is not intended to apply to individual undertakers or capitalists, but to the *system*; while the private owner of a manufactory, for instance, may be admitted to be a very estimable citizen. This is no doubt true; but is it not true, also, that the agitators have purposely excited a hostility in the minds of the working-class against the employers? And so, if ever socialism should venture on its last step, that step will be the more sure to be a violent one, the further the social demagogues depart from the spirit of conciliation and sober argument.

Socialists do not regard as doubtful the final conversion of private into collective capital, "nor does the uncommon difficulty of the transition to the new order of things give them much anxiety. For they reckon on the vast multitude of the 'expropriated,' as contrasted with the few 'expropriators';" on the considerations that the process

of destruction of the middle class will at length be complete, and that the continuance of private production by the help of workingmen, thoroughly discontented and devoid of all faith in authority, must at length cease."

The questions of right on the part of the capitalist, and of compensation when he shall have come to the end of his power of private production, are next considered. The socialists say something like this: "The '*bourgeois*' may have a right to that which he has earned under the present system of production, and we can let him have a compensation for his private capital, just as he paid off the feudal rights." "Socialism is not disinclined to grant damages to the present class of private owners of property, if they good-naturedly allow themselves to be expropriated; but the kind of expropriation must be such as will be consistent with the principles of the social state." They could not receive the rents of former property; but might be paid "in means of enjoyment" even to the full money value of their possessions. "It is easily conceived," says our author, "that in this method of compensation the gigantic capital of the Rothschilds and their compeers, even when the fullest payment should be made to them, could pass over into a stifling abundance of means of enjoyment. Such vast possessions could continue with them only for a time. Private capital, however

large, would necessarily be set aside and terminate *at once* as capital, and ere long as property; for *perpetual* rents, paid even in the shape of orders for means of enjoyment, would by no means, on grounds of principle, be granted by the socialistic state." We apprehend, however, that things would not come to such a pass as is here contemplated. *In the first place*, the property of the upper class, if they were unwilling to give up their rights and should try the fortunes of war unsuccessfully, would be confiscated at the end of the struggle. *In the second place*, if the new state should agree to a compensation at all adequate to the claims, it would not be paid. The notion of a satisfaction or even of partial amends seems well-nigh chimerical, especially at the point of time when a new government, wholly inexperienced, would be at the beginning of a wholly new experiment in the history of the world.

The social state being conceived of as established, and having all production, transportation, and furnishing of supplies in its hands; it would seem plain that not much choice would be left to private persons, in reference to articles they would wish to use, and to the satisfaction of their desires. The state makes, brings, and offers at its storehouse, in exchange for certificates of hours' work, everything which is placed within the reach of individuals, and has no competitor in these functions. Will human beings, who are

all of them agents of the state or workmen of the state, be content with such a bill of fare for life as the state sees fit to set before them; and is not such a scheme of society a destruction of a very large part of individual liberty? Schaeffle admits the force of this objection, and adds that "socialism itself has done its best to repel men from itself" at this very point. Many of its adherents "have promised to the proletariat a half royal collective luxury of public feasts, of enjoyments from art and the like; but have left over to private housekeeping and the personal freedom of procuring supplies scarcely a square foot of liberty, scarcely an inch of domestic comfort and an agreeable home."

Our author, however, maintains that collective production can have its statistics of recurring individual and family wants, and can provide for these wants as effectively as is now done in the open market under the sway of demand and supply. He sees no reason why, on the system of social production, individual wants and requisitions may not meet with due attention. "If socialism were to do away with this power of satisfying personal wants, it would deserve to be looked on as the deadly foe of all freedom, of all civilization, of all material and intellectual well-being. The one practical principle of all freedom—to be able to spend one's own incomes according to his pleasure—would alone be too valuable to

be parted with for all the advantages of social reform. The first understanding with socialism must be made on this very ground." We thank our author for these expressions of his opinions. The programme of living is made by the socialist not for the really free, but for those whom they agitate. Those who have been used to better things and to free choices of their own are not taken into account.

If production and the supply of wants through a nation can be put into the hands of the state, it is easier still to conceive of the means of communication as being managed by the state alone. To a great extent the post, the telegraph, and the railroad are under public control already, in advance of the socialistic state, and no essentially new arrangements would need to be made in this department of work.

In respect to production, the principal department of work, Schaeffle remarks that a stop needs not to be put, all at once, to private operations. One branch after another can be converted into the new form of industry. Nor will it be essential that every kind of production should ever be required to conform rigorously to the theory. Production for one's own support, without sale to others, would be one of these exceptions. Production which consists in personal services, like that of the physician or the artist, would be another. In such cases concurrence or competi-

tion, the great bugbear of socialism, might be endured; and the service would be remunerated by the tickets of work obtained by the workman for his labor and handed over to his personal helper. Those personal services, however, which need a considerable capital, would be regarded as public offices and be paid publicly, whether offices of the state, the commune, or the school.

A radical consideration in all production is the cost; and here the socialists claim that in their system, where every one is interested in the efficiency of every other, costs will be likely to be less, and, therefore, the dividend to each workman greater, than in the present system of work and wages. Our author doubts whether socialistic labor will, of course, have this advantage; but expresses no very positive opinion. To us it appears as if an unknown quantity enters into the question. Everything depends on the influence of the new conditions of work and on the new causes in general acting upon the character of the workmen themselves. Will they be made manly, self-relying, conscientious, and provident, or the opposite of all this? And within the states where capital and competition prevail, are there not possible and feasible means of raising up the working classes into something better than their present condition?

The principal question, however, is a broader one. As Schaeffle states it, it is whether social-

ism will ever be in a condition to make use of that great psychological truth, in conformity with which, under the present laws of industry, private interest is made serviceable to production,—whether on its own ground, it can ever rival the system of private capital in this respect. "We hold this question to be the decisive, although until now by no means the decided point, on which, in the long run, everything depends; from which the victory or defeat of socialism, the reform or destruction of civilization, is to proceed, as far as causes can act which are within the province of political economy."

In considering this important point, which has less to do with the nature than with the working power of socialism, the author makes the just remark that it is not enough, in a million of producers, for any one of them to know that his final earnings depend on the fact that the others are as industrious as he. This fails to arouse the necessary self-control. It does not extinguish laziness and prevent the embezzlement of time due to all the rest. Socialism is bound to make every single laborer as strongly interested in the result, on his own private and separate account, as he is in the present system of labor. Whether it can succeed in this respect or not, no one is authorized to assert. The question stands at the door of a scientific discussion. But this, as the author thinks, can be asserted, that at present the

programme of the socialists lacks practical clearness of thought touching the necessity of organized concurrence in work. "And yet there is no doubt that, if the competition of the present form of industry should fall away, there would be need of emulation in work to take its place." But how, we ask, could this exist when everything goes by the rule of the average worth of labor?

Our author accompanies these criticisms with another which shows that he as yet differs from the socialists, as it respects the theory of work, on a most important point. As long, says he, as the social theory takes into account, in determining the value of articles, only the *social costs*, leaving out of sight the value in *use*, as affected by place, time, etc., it will be wholly incapable of solving its own problem of production by collective capital in any method which political economy can accept. So long as in this sphere it does not furnish something different and more positive, it can have no outlook for the future. Otherwise in proposing to give up, in favor of a more righteous process of distributing the results of labor (the shady sides of which cannot yet be found out by experience), a form of production which, with its many shady sides, contains, to a tolerable extent, many-sided securities, such as political economy demands—in such a proposal it can bring nothing to a practical issue, and, if

determined to carry its theory through by force, it will have but temporary success.

There remain a number of very important results of the socialist form of industry and capital, of which we will speak in the next section of our work.

II.

SCHAEFFLE'S "QUINTESSENCE OF SOCIALISM" CONCLUDED.

The principle of socialism opposes the continuance of private property not only as it respects the direct means of production, but also as to everything from which gains are indirectly acquired. Thus it wages war against all forms of private credit, against the whole system of loans, against leasing, renting, and hiring. Leases must come to an end, unless the state should undertake that business, because it has become, by the triumph of socialism, the sole proprietor of land. Houses and places of business cannot be hired, rented, or sold; for they have all become public property, over which the state alone has control. Ground-rents must lapse, because the old owner of the house or soil is either paid off or expropriated. The state must, like manufacturers now, make advances to the workingmen during the process of work; but it will have abundant security in its hands for such current prepayments.

The state, if it wished to borrow on its own credit, would need to go into some foreign market ; and for its ordinary expenses would of necessity appropriate a part of the productions, in the creation of which it had a share. Credit between private persons, all the operations of domestic or of foreign exchange, all investments waiting for a favorable change in the market, all speculation, would cease and be forgotten.

Still further, as private capital, employed in trade and commerce, is impossible under the institutions of socialism, all trade, unless on the lowest scale conceivable, must come to an end, and with it all metallic currency. The circulation of the social state will be not *greenbacks*, issued on the credit of the government—for socialism, with all its wrong views, has no such dishonesty in it as that would imply—but *certificates of work*, representing labor actually accomplished by the workingmen—that is, by the community.

We turn our attention first to trade and commerce. In society, as it is now, the whole office of exchanging products falls to individuals, who act, each for himself, and who intend to remunerate themselves out of their transactions. Their success depends on individual skill and enterprise ; and the consumer is protected against high prices by their competition. In the social state the passage of commodities from the producer to the consumer must put on an entirely new form. Com-

petition is of all operations the most abhorred by socialism. There can be within its pale no buying up of any product for the purpose of selling again. Everything (unless in some employments, products needed for the family), must go to the storehouse, and from thence, by "social means of transportation," wherever else it is wanted. How could the competition of dealers begin to exist in such a system, and how could any dealer compete with the agents of the state? Thus the sale of wares in the open market, together with trade, the profits of trade, the market, and the exchange, must cease altogether.

The difference between the present order of things in an economical respect and the socialistic order is nowhere wider than just here. "The three main problems, at present, to be solved in the market (or the speculation market, as Schaeffle calls it) are these: to determine the amount of things needed, to determine the quantity and quality of productions that can be procured to satisfy men's needs, and to keep up continually a value in exchange which will preserve the equilibrium between production and consumption. But in the socialistic state the functionaries who would have to do with sales would ascertain the amounts needed, would distribute the national work accordingly among the different classes of people doing business, and the persons concerned in production, transportation, and storage; and would assign to

the products a value according to the mass of socially necessary work-time spent upon them." What contrast could be greater?

With this revolution another would go in company. The corruption of the press in affairs of business, its willingness to lend itself to private speculation, would cease when private competition ceased; and the whole system of costly and luxurious advertisements, as well as the enormous expense for the rent of elegant shops, would no longer be of any use.

A metallic currency would disappear from the socialistic state, as readily and as soon as private capital and its operations should disappear. It would not be needed between the members of such a community any more than between the members of a family. In balances of trade with foreign countries it would be of use; but not in settling balances within the state itself. That gold and silver would play no great part in such a state is plain from the consideration of their leading functions. As measures of value they are superseded by the average value of labor, estimated by the whole sum of social products. As a circulating medium they would be superseded by tickets or certificates of actual labor in the past, which would be effective and current, as long as anything was in the government-stores, subject to the calls of the people.

This species of time-money will also suffice for

the expenses of the public, as well as for the satisfaction of personal wants. The socialistic state, it must be remembered, like every other state, has nothing to pay its own expenses with. It must draw all its supplies from its own working people. Of course, if public expenses (for the state, the commune, the schools, etc.) needed one-third of the value of the hours of work, the certificates for these hours must be good to the workingman or other holder for two-thirds of their worth. The state would need to dispose of its third of products remaining in the storehouses as it best might. That at times, as in famine or sudden war, a state which cannot readily borrow money, as a socialistic state could not, must be brought into serious straits is quite evident.

At this point Mr. Schaeffle notices two difficulties, one of which has met us before. This is the theoretical and fundamental point of determining the value of commodities by the cost of work alone, without taking demand into consideration. The other is a practical difficulty—whether the socialistic state could ever master the enormous book-keeping necessary for its purposes, and could bring unlike kinds of work into just relations by a standard of equal lengths of working time. He gives no confident answer to these questions of his own. "In itself considered," he remarks, "to make use of the factor of utility in estimating social values is not a thing inconceiva-

ble. Where all production goes forward on one plan, it will soon be perceived when and where a particular production exceeds or falls below the public demand. In the existing form of industry, this is known by prices in the market. Production is diminished, and individuals seek employment elsewhere. This law of industry, now acting where capital and private property are found, must enter into the social system. The present error of socialists, in making value [*i. e.*, value in exchange] the only factor in estimating costs, must be given up in regard to the appraisal of work and in regard to the appraisal of products. When the value in use [as discovered by means of changes in demand] sinks, both must suffer abatements; when it rises, both must have advances made in them. Without this introduction of value in use into social estimates—that is, without imitating the present market in all its processes of settling value in exchange—it would be impossible, by any control of the system of work in a country, to bring the demand for commodities into harmony, as it respects quantity and quality, with the supply of work and of goods. Three things depend on the right adjustment of the theory of value in exchange. *First*, this possibility of preserving a balance in such a vast mass of work, production, and wants; *second*, the concession of the necessary individual freedom of work and of consumption; and, *third*, a general

stimulus, given, according to economical laws, to individuals in proportion to their working power or efficiency."

Unless socialism, our author concludes, is able to unite to its own unquestioned specific advantages all the good sides of the existing freedom of work and of economy, it can have no outlook for the future, nor any fair claim that it is able to make its theory a reality. It must remain a Utopia.—We add that, after such warnings from political economists who have no leanings against socialism, to put it to the test by experiment on the vast scale of a great nation like Germany, until impartial experts should be fully satisfied, would be madness. It is a pity, if it is ever to be tried, that it could not first have a colony of socialists for its subject. It ought to be, for the safety of the rest of the world, an *experimentum in corpore vili*.

The last stage in which we shall accompany Mr. Schaeffle is implied in the questions which he undertakes to answer: "What shape would income eventually take in a social state, and how would it be used in the consumption and the formation of private property?"

It is unnecessary to remind our readers that the entire income of individuals in the social state must come from work (excepting those cases where former capitalists receive annuities of "means of enjoyment"—not of money—from the govern-

ment). The income of the state itself is drawn, in the same way, as a uniform deduction from that which is due to the citizens—that is, to the workers. Whatever the state had fixed upon as necessary to meet the public wants, and pay the public servants, that amount could be directly drawn from the store of products, which are all under the charge of public officers. This ease and simplicity of taxation (or of getting a public income) has not been set forth, as it deserves to be, in the socialistic writers.

As for the possible uses of private income, it may be spent or saved by the owner, or be transferred to others on condition of reimbursement, or given away to a third person. 1. The use of his income—that is, of his certificates of work—would be uncontrolled in the social state, just as in states of the existing form; the only restriction being what any state would impose, that it must not be spent for uses prejudicial to the welfare of the community.

2. To the title of savings and the formation of private property Mr. Schaeffle devotes quite a long discussion. The substance of what he says is this: While no property producing other property can be allowed by the social state to remain in private hands; property in means of enjoyment—such as articles of food, clothing, furniture, books, works of art—may be not only acquired, but transmitted by inheritance [and would

naturally remain untaxed]. Socialists resent the charge of periodic division of private savings among the members of society, as well they might; for if such a usage were introduced there would soon be nothing to divide. In regard to inheritance, it is true that hot-heads have wished to abolish it altogether; but as long as capital, especially in the instruments of production, is taken out of the possibility of such transmission by belonging exclusively to the state or community, the sphere of the right of transmitting property would be so narrow that its exercise would produce no essential inequality, or other disturbance of the system. Moreover, if allowed, it might serve as a stimulus to a larger number of hours' work. The leading socialists, therefore, find at this point no inconsistency with their general scheme.

Whether socialism is favorable to family life, and to wedlock in its form of indissoluble monogamy, is an important point which our author does not wholly pass over. Some socialists have had low and loose views on these all-important institutions; but the system does not necessarily call for a kind of community life which is opposed to the highest development of the family.—The relations of the system in itself considered, of the society cherished by it, of its influence on ideals of morality and virtue, lie outside of the present discussion, and must be considered in another place.

3. Less consistent with the nature of socialism does it appear that it should look with favor upon a loan to others of what a person has saved from the fruit of his toil. To do this in the way of a note drawing interest does, indeed, seem altogether opposed to the purpose for which capital had been abolished; but to do it on promise of a future return, or to accompany such a loan with some kind of pledge or insurance, might well be permitted. So, also, "the concentration of larger amounts for private purposes—such as travel, study, common efforts—would by no means be opposed to the principles of socialism."

4. The possibility and liberty of free gifts to relatives, to some third person, or to a society of persons, would not be forbidden by the nature of the social state. If the sums thus collected formed no fund, properly speaking, from which interest could be derived, there would be no restriction imposed by the social state on their collection or distribution. Thus all the purposes of humanity, benevolence, and religion, of art and science, would meet with no public opposition.

"One point needs to be touched upon by itself. Socialism, as it is apparent, is through and through irreligious and hostile to the Church. Socialists pronounce the Church to be a police institution in the hands of capital, and that it cheats the prole-

tarian 'by bills of exchange on Heaven.' It deserves to perish."

Hatred to religion, however, is denied by Mr. Schaeffle to be essential to the system and nature of socialism. It is true that no endowed church could exist under its shadow; *but such institutions* might be maintained as could be supported by voluntary contributions, and were not connected with worldly interests and classes opposed to socialism. Even direct support of the Church by public authority, out of the national income [that is, by deductions drawn from the cost of work], would be, at all events, possible, although not very probable. And this voluntary method might be resorted to for various institutions outside of the state's agency, for the promotion of social, religious, scientific, technological, political, and socialistic efforts.

Thus, if socialism confines itself to its true principles—that of realizing the system of collective production—it can come into opposition to no such free movements of unions of individuals as have been mentioned. "Objections to all this proceed from the folly and frivolity of single socialists, not from the principle of the system. They have no support from the politico-economical principle which has more and more become the central point of socialism; and which will, in all probability, form the pivot on which the principal social contest will turn. The destruction of the 'high-

est and most ideal blessings of civilization' would certainly attach itself to a wild revolutionary endeavor to make socialism a reality; but such destruction need not be the result of a development, in which the question at issue between the third and fourth classes of society is strictly limited to its scientific essence, and in which further progress is made to adhere to the path of specific reform."

We close our consideration of this able, and in the main impartial, work with two remarks. The first is that, when the author, in the latter part of his work, shows socialism to be more expansible as a plan of industrial society than many have thought, his gain in this is rather scientific than practical. All that he says may be true; but of what great importance is it, so long as the system itself is so narrow and restrictive? It is as if one should seek to show that a man with two fingers can do every sort of thing which another man can do with five. True, he can, one may say; but can he do as much and do it as well? Will not society be lame and crippled under socialism, after all?

The other remark is that a socialistic state may be very ingeniously constructed and neatly arranged; it may excite the admiration of able political economists; but, after all, the theory of political economy is one thing—the living and acting state—the moral entity to which all the valua-

ble treasures of the individual man and of society are committed, is another. To this higher question—to the relations between this socialistic state and the most important human interests—we will now bespeak our readers' attention.

CHAPTER VII.

I.

RECENT SOCIALISM IN ITS RELATIONS TO THE STATE AND
TO SOCIETY.

WE seem to have now reached some definite ideas in regard to the plans and aims of German socialism, which, in its politico-economical stage, is commanding the attention of thinkers in all civilized countries. Its programme is now honestly avowed, and its theory is ready, as far as the opinions of the party are concerned, to be reduced to practice. If the hopes of the most sanguine members of the party were in any respect prophetic, it would be successful without long conflict. The feeling seems to be that the upper classes will be dismayed and be ready for a compromise, when they see the forces of the fourth class, or proletariat, arrayed against them. We are the people, the latter naturally say. We have served out our time in military training; and those who conquered France by superior discipline have a great advantage to start with in a domestic contest.

But in such a thorough change of society as socialism contemplates there is no room for compromise. The plan is to take away all the means of production—all land, machinery, manufactories, all means of transport—from private persons, and transfer property in them to the state; to abolish all private trade, credit, business relations, and the medium of circulation, without which these could not go on; so that there is not a work in life, not an employment or pursuit, that would not be put on a wholly new basis. What room for compromise is there here? There never was a revolution in history, since history told the story of the world, so complete as this. Nations have passed under the sway of conquerors; but an age or two brought back the rights of property and free management of their affairs to multitudes of the conquered. Nations have been deported to distant settlements; but multitudes thrived in the land of exile, or their descendants were restored to their properties in the old home. Is it conceivable that, with all the personal evils which stand at the very door of such a change in view, multitudes would succumb and compromise rather than risk their lives for an essential good and a sacred right, as they regard it, of themselves and their posterity?

As the issue in such a conflict is uncertain, so the form which the state, constructed on the ruins of private property would assume, would be un-

certain, except so far as the industrial changes should require some special conformation of the government. We have, then, a problem to solve, when the social state is to be considered, which has to take some uncertain factors into account. But we have more right to speculate on this point than socialists themselves have; for our speculations can do little harm if they prove false, while theirs, if they prove false, may involve themselves and their countries in remediless ruin.

Properly speaking, we need to look at two points—the *governments* under which the socialists hope to carry out their industrial theory, and the *form of state polity* which the theory itself seems to render necessary. As for the inclinations and opinions of the socialists and communists, there is no question that, as a body, from the commencement of the French Revolution, both in France and elsewhere, they have leaned toward the principle of equality as the main foundation of a well-regulated state. But equality is a broad term, and the question at once arises how much must it include? Liberty and equality stand side by side in all the declarations of French political Utopias. But it is evident that, if personal liberty has the breadth of rights which is conceded to it even in some arbitrary governments, equality of condition and inequality of situation, or of amount of worldly advantages, may be found together; so that a conflict must

necessarily arise between the two, which cannot easily be adjusted. Equality of *condition*, the absence of all ranks and orders, secured by constitutions, would be accepted by all socialists as a *sine qua non*, before the working class can be raised above the disadvantages which encounter them in modern society; but inequality of *situation*, some power by which the free action of an individual may enable him to rise above a general level, is clung to, in existing society, far more tenaciously than the proper democratic principle of equality in political rights and the sameness of condition throughout society.

The feeling of equality, then, is not confined to the equal diffusion of political rights; but it extends to material advantages. It is the feeling of one competitor toward another—the same feeling which has led and may again lead to the lot, as preventing a man of more influence and ability from gaining an office by his ability. The world is not full enough and never will be full enough of material goods to satisfy all; and if the struggle for them were not checked by the social system, one would secure for himself more than another, if the state did not interpose. It is not to be denied that evils attend on the present system of unlimited power to gain wealth; but the point which we now make is that, in seeking to prevent these evils, the social theories find it necessary to restrict the freedom of individuals,

especially the power of rising by enterprise, soundness of judgment, unbounded energy, and other qualities, which not only aid the individual in his advancement, but contribute to the improvement of general society.

When the individual is confined by law and public institutions in his sphere of operations, society loses a great part of its force; and the state must acquire an equal or greater amount of force, or all the hopes of a community will be shipwrecked. Thus, if private capital is to cease, the state must have the new function of general business director, or there will soon be no state at all. Is it not perfectly evident that the state must become exceedingly strong to undertake such new duties, in addition to many of its old ones? And may we not argue with certainty, from the checks which society, as it now is, puts on the occasional violence and arbitrary power of the state, that, when society is stripped of its force in opinion and in action, a vast increase of independence, even a despotical sway must be gained by the state from this source also?

The state, then, under socialism must become strong and uncontrollable, not only because new offices are committed to it, but also because these offices are taken away from society and from its individual members, who now will no longer be able to oppose, or correct, or enlighten the state in favor of the interests of general society. What

the form of the state in its socialistic era would be is of little importance. The essential characteristic is that it must become all but unlimited; and our readers are well aware that all unlimited governments are more like one another, whether they be called monarchies or oligarchies or democracies, than they are each like to a limited government of their own name. We can hardly question that genuine socialists would prefer that constitution which was best for their purposes. If it were an unlimited monarchy, provided no ranks or orders were allowed to exist, it could pass with the greatest ease into an unlimited democracy and *vice versa*. [See Appendix I., end of this chapter.]

There is no doubt that during the period of strife with other parties the socialists will contend for *universal suffrage*, and that their agitators will maintain democratic principles; but, as one of their friends asserts, when they have reached their goal, they may find the general vote no longer essentially required. Their public manifestoes, however, such as the programmes of Eisenach and Gotha, breathe the democratic spirit in an extreme. What can be more so than the demands made at Gotha of direct legislation, and of decision concerning war and peace by the people? But the leaders, doubtless, have much wiser opinions of their own. Schaeffle says ("Quintessenz," p. 29) that "the general right to

vote would not be absolutely necessary for socialism after it had reached its goal."

A strong government would be especially needed in the period of transition and the beginnings of the new state; for then old memories would not have died out, the power of combination would not have entirely ceased, and the difficulties that might attend the working of the new machine would encourage its enemies.

But let us see how the destruction of private property in the means of production and the establishment of the socialistic state would affect individuals and their rights. First of all, we mention the right of *property*. This, we have seen, is swept wholly away, except so far as terminable annuities, "payable in means of enjoyment," may be granted to such rich men as do not oppose the change of order, and so far as workmen may lay up their savings for the future pleasures (not the future profits) of themselves and their heirs. This is as far as Schaeffle can go, with a seeming desire to bring socialism into a nearer likeness to existing politics. And, furthermore, there is in such a state no power belonging to the individual to rise above his existing condition. In fact, the author already quoted is at pains to show the social party that freedom of movement of laborers is necessary to act as a balance to changes in demand which must come upon their industrial republic. But, according to

the programme, the workers are fixed in situation, *glebæ ascripti*, and removable by the state, as far as we can see, from one place and workshop to another, as the Roman *coloni* or serfs were fixed, and only removable by the proprietor. Is not this the beginning of a new order of serfdom, as the government officials of the workshops and storehouses might well become a new class of feudal lords? It is impossible, if these conditions of society should be lasting, that some new relations of a political and social kind should not gain a foothold in the new order of society.

How far the workingmen would have *self-government* in prosecuting their *employments* we are unable to conjecture. In the *ateliers* of the French socialists to some extent the operatives could elect their own headmen and supervisors; but we can hardly conceive of this as practicable in a vast system under government control. If, in great operations at present, the employer or undertaker has great responsibility thrown upon him as it respects styles and fashions of goods, changes of machinery, estimation of amount of demand, and other particulars; it would seem that the leading managers of manufactories in the social state ought to be invested with an equal share of responsibility, unless the system should fail utterly.

There is *one form of labor*, and that of prime importance, about which we have seen but few

opinions expressed. We refer to agriculture. Here the analogy of manufacturing industry readily suggests itself, and farming on a great scale, placed in the hands of an association of laborers, is one of the forms most naturally thought of. The association pays the state a rent; or the system is managed exactly as a manufactory would be, the laborers receiving tickets for their hours' work, the cost of this labor being estimated after long calculation, and the tickets entitling the holder to draw from the storehouses whatever he may desire, according to the amount of his claims. But it is obvious that, as men will till separate pieces of ground and must use in part their own products for daily consumption, the difficulties attending exact equality of distribution will be great. As this class of workingmen in some countries quite outnumbers all others, the problem is not only difficult, but of vast importance. It would seem that their liberty of moving from one place to another would naturally be more restricted than that of manufacturing workmen. [See Appendix II., end of chapter.]

The *intercourse* of a socialistic country with foreign parts would wholly fall under the state's control and direction. Such intercourse would be necessary for procuring raw materials which could not be cultivated at home, and articles of luxury from tropical countries. The commerce

could not be of great amount, and might be left in the hands of some maritime nation.

The *finances* of the social state have already been noticed. They would be managed in the simplest manner possible, as far as the original levy should go; for they are nothing but first-fruits of the productions of the people. When thus gathered, the state could dispose of them as it pleased—at home or in foreign parts—in exchanging its receipts with military or civil work, paying officers, supporting public charities. We can easily see that it would need at no time to be at a loss for funds, for in any emergency it could put its hand into the depositories of certificates of labor, and take the wages of a day or a month to itself all over the country.

It must not be supposed, however, that these *taxes* would, of course, be a *very small aliquot part* of the entire product. As the state would play the part of the employer-capitalist and of the government too, it would need to expend money in both characters; as, indeed, we have already had occasion to remark. It might then be found that the bitter complaints against capitalists for “robbing” laborers related to nothing which the state would not do as readily. And in an exigency, when war, or famine, or internal revolt, should fall upon the social state, it would be less able to provide for the sudden call than states are now. To borrow money at home would be

out of the question ; to borrow it abroad would be exceedingly difficult.

The *capacity* of such a state to *engage in defensive war* would be extremely limited ; and in *offensive war* it would be a still weaker assailant. On the other hand, the motives for attacking it would be small, since the change in its polity would withdraw it from most of its former intercourse with foreign states, and it would live within itself. *Internal dissensions* might be frequent and chronic, as long as old local feuds continued, for it would have no strong army prepared to repress local outbreaks.

How far could such a state secure the regards of its inhabitants, and would *patriotism* be a strong sentiment among them ? We can hardly bring ourselves in thought into the feelings of such communities ; but one cannot help believing that the ties which bind many nations to their countries, even when they are misgoverned, would be all gone. Centuries would flow away before they could have any history. They would live in comparative separation from the rest of the world. What progress they could have it is not easy to imagine. Their institutions would have become industrial, rather than political. The ennobling influences of political and historical life would have all passed away.

We add that the rich diversity found in the social life of the peasantry would wholly cease under

the reign of socialism. Every civilized state in its present form presents the spectacle of innumerable differences in employments, of men selecting their professions—the same family having representatives in several departments even among scientific men, artists, men of letters, in the learned professions, adorning and ennobling society. There is, in fact, an activity, and for the most part, a hopefulness in existing society which adds greatly to the enjoyment of life. But all this depends on the freedom of the individual to choose his career, and the power to choose greatly depends on the accumulation of property and the cultivation of mind and taste. In a socialistic state all this would be lost. The whole mass of living beings would be devoted to work under state agents. Can anything be conceived of more monotonous than the uniformity of such a system, not to speak of its incapacity to answer to the higher wants of man and to his privilege of shaping his life for himself?

II.

THE INDIVIDUAL AND RELIGION IN THE SOCIALISTIC STATE.

If the remarks we have now made have any justice in them, they show that the socialistic state would increase in power by taking away power

from individuals, and from voluntary communities of whatever kind. The number of persons freely using their own exertions for their own support would dwindle down almost to zero. Associations united together by any tie except that of common work would be almost unknown. Especially would the state, as the director of nearly all work, so impress its power on society, in its various communities, that opposition to the will of the state would be feeble; and, if not fear, at least a want of interest in political affairs would, as it seems, pervade the whole nation

There would be little of *enterprise or of public spirit* in the people of a state under such a constitution. The possibility of rising in the world is taken away by the form of society, because there is only one class of people besides the agents and supervisors, and these are appointed by the government or by the communities. A very great stimulus, in states where capital exists, is imparted by the form of society to all classes, especially to the humbler part of the small proprietors. The shoemaker or carpenter in such a country as the United States, the man who has one or two journeymen on his working-benches, is in the best position to rear an honest and frugal family. He knows the value of knowledge; he is a free man, able to judge and act in the affairs of his township and his state; he values education for his children, if he had not had its advantages

himself. These are the persons who have an individuality of their own; who are cultivated by domestic life; who are not in a hurry nor discontented with their place in the world, but feel that the world is a good place for them and theirs to live in; who want no help from the government, but rather to be left alone with their rights and their opportunities. There is a vast number of such persons, in a land like the United States, scattered over the farms and in the towns and villages, who have a stimulus, perhaps without knowing it, from our form of society; and this spirit of enterprise they transmit to their children. But in the socialistic institutions I see nothing calculated to inspire hope or to elevate the workingman. His condition is unalterable, except that by working two or three hours longer, if the state will consent, he may receive two or three more certificates of hours' work, which he may use as he will.

In such a state, again, the *circulation of knowledge* will have obstacles put in its way; not by direct power, indeed, but by the nature of the institutions. Every modern programme, it is true, of the workingmen's parties of every name, demands gratuitous, compulsory education for all children, and the opening of technological and other scientific schools over the land. Without doubt, they are sincere in this, for the agitators, having the boundless possibilities of the future

in their hands, can weave out of them many glorious visions. But let us look at the spread of knowledge in a socialistic state. In whose hands would it be? The state might undertake such an office; but who supposes that it would be done well? The state might produce as many yards of cloth or barrels of flour as were needed, and of as good quality, it may be, as capitalists could; but neither state nor capitalist could make good books to order, and they would be sure to be bad if the state forced them into the places of education. It wants freedom of thought, independence, a creative impulse to make good books in all departments but pure science; and the state would not be likely to let books be printed at its expense, the principles of which, in government or in political economy, opposed its own.

As for large printing-houses, established by associations, they would scarcely be allowed in a state built on the exclusion of all private capital from its borders; and the newspaper press would exist, if it existed at all, under great disadvantages. If sustained, it would derive its support from tickets of work, the circulation of the land. Its machinery and buildings would belong to the state, or to some association dependent on it; and it could be crushed with no difficulty if it became obnoxious.

In such a state, again, there would be little of *intelligent public opinion*. The nature of the state

would prevent all free spontaneous movement. We have already seen that the mobility of workmen themselves—their freedom to remove elsewhere and seek other work—would meet with obstacles. The parts of the general society would be poorly united together by the intercourse of friends, travellers, and business. Indeed, society would become somewhat like the old caste systems, with the upper castes left out.

Whether the state would tolerate new opinions, and concede to advocates of private property the same right of attacking social institutions which socialists now have of attacking the present institutions of society, may well be doubted; for the moment the political economy on which the state was built began to be questioned, that moment the state itself would be in danger. No sufficient reason against a change of polity would exist unless it were found in that science. That, therefore, is the industrial, political, social basis of the whole order of things.

But we have gone, perhaps, into greater details than were called for respecting institutions which may never be realized, or, if set on foot, might move in an oblique direction, under some force of the ancient order of things which could not be neutralized. We will now pass on to another inquiry, the relation of communism and socialism to religion. Here two points demand our consideration: the first, *the attitude and feeling*

of communists in the past toward revealed religion and its institutions; and the other, the inquiry whether socialism in its nature *must* take a certain position toward religion, or whether it may be or become hostile, neutral, or friendly, as historical or social causes may determine.

The earlier communists—Plato and his followers in Christian times, who conceived of small commonwealths as the places where their theories were to be tried—cannot be called enemies to religion; although they show the essential defect that marks most philosophic Utopias—the want of a full conviction that there is a defect in human nature, which nothing but religion, becoming a force within the soul, can cure. Plato was far from irreligion and insensibility to religious ideas, as is shown by the charm his best speculations have had for religious minds, both among the Christian Fathers and in later times. But most of the communists within the pale of Christendom, who have shown some sympathy with Christian ideas, have rejected Christian facts, and held simply to the sentiment of love or a somewhat exalted fraternity. Out of this principle in France was developed Religious Communism. This fraternity was its seed-corn; for, as another has said, in spite of the Revolution and its fearful irreligiousness, the old faith had struck too deep roots in many hearts, and even in whole circles, to be entirely banished out of its home.

Of Lamennais's influence in propagating a form of doctrine into which some Christian thoughts infused themselves, and which, for all that, was communistic and anti-Christian, we have spoken in another place. Others followed in his steps, with a wider departure from the true spirit of the New Testament. And in the School of St. Simon, as well as among those who, like Leroux, were at first scholars of that school, religious ideas strayed about, as if trying to find a home from which they had been banished. Leroux himself had the same theosophic tendency, without a faith in Christ. As another says, he held that "Christianity at its first appearance was a great step forward, and comprised truths until then perceived by the highest intellects only; but that Christianity—such, at least, as it was understood to be during the Middle Ages—has exhausted all its juices. It has produced all that it could produce for the advancement of humanity. Since the Reformation, for four centuries, it has ceased to preside over the movement of ideas in Europe. To-day it is dead, and nothing of it remains but its carcass. It pertains to philosophy to take its place and to construct a new religion. The elements of this philosophical religion should be found in the past period of humanity. All that is to be done is to collect, bring together, and formulate them." (A. Sudre.)

A large part of the thinkers of France, and

nearly all of those who leaned toward communism had discarded Christianity; but, far worse than this, the great mass of the workmen in Paris and other towns of France were leavened with unbelief in God and Christ. A very striking passage from one of the writings of Leroux, entitled "Three Discourses to Philosophers, to Politicians, and to Artists," Paris, 1831, so powerfully represents the state of religious belief among the workingmen at that time, that, although the extract is of some length, I cannot resist the temptation of quoting it:

Since there are no longer on the earth any but material things—material goods, gold, or a dung-heap—every man that breathes has the right to say to you: "Give me my share of this gold, or this dung-heap."

"The partition is made," answers to him the spectre of society, as we have it to-day.

"I find it made badly," replies the man, in his turn.

"But you were well content with it heretofore," says the spectre.

"Heretofore," answers the man, "there was a God in heaven, a paradise to gain, a hell to fear. There was also on earth a society. I had my part in that society; for, if I was a subject, I had, at least, a subject's right—the right to obey without being abased. My master did not command me in the name of his selfishness; his power over me ascended back to God, who permitted inequality on the earth. We had the same morals, the same religion. In the name of these morals and this religion, to serve was to obey God, and to pay my protector on earth with devotion. Then, if I was inferior in the lay society, I was the equal of all in that spiritual society which they call the church. There in-

equality did not at all reign ; there all men were brothers. I had my part in this church, under the title of child of God and fellow-heir with Christ. And this church, moreover, was but the vestibule and the image of the real church, of the celestial church, toward which my gaze and my hopes turned. I had my part in the promised Paradise, and in view of that Paradise the earth faded away from my sight. The soldiers of the church on earth were at my service to direct me and aid me to gain the celestial church. I had prayer ; I had the sacraments ; I had repentance and the pardon of my God. I have lost all that. I have no Paradise to hope for more ; there is no longer any church ; you have taught me that Christ was an impostor. I do not know whether there is a God ; but I know that they who make the law scarcely believe there is—or pretend to believe, which is much worse. You have reduced everything to gold and a dung-heap. I want my part of this gold and this dung-heap.”

Thus, because the earth is an empty temple, and Christ has left his throne, there is nothing of value save what the man of toil can clutch and handle. The material world alone survives the ruins of faith, and is all the more precious. So the social leaders teach, so the followers believe, that the good time coming is to be a relief of material inequalities and discomforts, with some elevation of the taste and intelligence of the proletariat ; but expect nothing from the power of religion. I must believe that, in Germany, they have lapsed from the Bible and the faith of Luther to as great an extent as the French have forsaken the faith of Pascal and St. Louis.

But let us appeal to witnesses drawn indiscriminately from socialists of various shades. The sentiments of Dupont, secretary of the International, and of Bakunin, we have already had occasion to cite. We place first in order a passage from one of the writings of Marx: "The evident proof of the radicalism of the German theory, and thus of its radical energy, is its starting-point from the decisive, positive abolition of religion. The critique of religion ends with the doctrine that man is the highest being for men; and thus with the categorical imperative of overthrowing all relations in which man is a degraded, enslaved, forsaken, contemptible being; relations which one cannot better describe than by the exclamation of a Frenchman, on occasion of a projected dog-tax: 'Poor dogs! they are going to treat you like men.'" Again, Boruttau, who has been, I believe, editor of the *Volksstaat*, said of socialism, in 1871, that "it is a new view of the world, which, in the department of religion, expresses itself as atheism; in that of politics, as republicanism; in that of economy, as communism." The same man had expressed himself, a little before, as follows: "The hope of a satisfying success of the socialistic revolution is a visionary Utopia, as long as we neglect to root out the superstition in a God, by a general and thorough enlightenment of the people. As none but socialists are in a condition or are inclined to do this,

it is our duty to carry this work through with zeal and devotion; and no man else is worthy of the name of socialist save he who, himself an atheist, devotes his exertions with all zeal to the spread of atheism." This is plain enough; but not plainer than the words of the *Vorbote*, a Swiss paper, uttered about the same time—"that he who seeks to bring science and religious faith into harmony, the function of his brain must already have been sadly brought into disharmony." (From Jäger.)

Let these citations suffice to show—what, indeed, no one can doubt—that socialism, to repeat Schaeffle's already cited words, "the socialism of to-day, is through and through irreligious and hostile to the church." But a further inquiry suggests itself. Is this so because socialism is essentially irreligious; or does it owe this quality not to its own doctrine, but to the men who first professed and propagated it? Has it made the workingmen atheists; or were they atheists or, at least, impregnated with the virus of atheism already? We close this paper with a very brief answer to one or two of these questions, reserving the consideration of the essential relation of socialism to religion for the next article.

First, then, the old German faith had begun to give way, within the church or churches themselves, some time before socialistic principles were thought of. The decay of religious life, the de-

cay of religious faith, proceeding from the efforts of the early rationalists to take as much of the supernatural as was possible from the Scriptures—these causes acted in the church, and in the minds of its teachers and preachers, until many from among the people began to think that the church was only the police of the state, set up to keep the lower classes in order.

Again, the freethinking which showed itself so mighty a destructive agent in France spread in Germany to a considerable extent, until the war of liberation caused a reaction. Then Germany began to teach philosophy to the rest of Europe; but philosophy, in the shape given to it by Hegel, became pantheistic, and, when it went down among the people, atheistic. To this source the departure of the nation from the faith of the Scriptures must be ascribed. So, then, the working-class was not so much to blame for their atheism as were those who had the intelligence of the country in their possession. Nor was it unnatural for the working-class to think that the rulers and the upper class considered religion as the tie to hold the country together and the restraining force to keep them quiet, without putting faith in it themselves. So thinking, the working-class could not but become disbelieving, and despise the upper class for its hypocrisy.

III.

RELATIONS OF SOCIALISM TO RELIGION, TO THE FAMILY,
AND TO MARRIAGE.

We deferred until the beginning of this section the question whether the hostile attitude of very many socialists to religion is a necessary or an accidental one; whether a theory which would abolish private property, the free satisfaction of individual wants, and nearly all the personal value of the individual in the community, has sympathies with a religious life in the soul, such as the Scriptures set forth; whether the existing want of faith, so deep-seated in this party, is likely to be as permanent as social principles themselves, or may give way to better convictions and consolations, when the evils in the present religious order of things shall have passed away.

Here we readily admit that in some forms of smaller communistic societies there has been sincere religion, although not only private property, but marriage also and a considerable amount of personal freedom, have been sacrificed for the imagined benefit of those institutions. But these are societies voluntary at the entrance, and generally allowing members to release themselves from their connection and take with them their property. There is also a certain degree of pres-

sure from the outside world, which helps them to be true to their convictions, and their life is free from many temptations. The communities as such hold property, buy and sell; and the individual members feel nearly the same kind of ownership in the common property which is felt by the shareholders of a railroad. The people in a social state are to such a degree unlike them in most particulars that you cannot argue with safety from the one to the other.

There is nothing in the nature of the state itself which socialists propose to found, from which a good omen can be drawn in favor of the cultivation of moral and spiritual truth. The leaders in Germany are Hegelians, and, as such, must be fatalists, so far as to recognize no personal power separate from and outside of the world. Hence, they lean toward absolute power in all things. The state, says Ahrens, "has an absolute power [in their eyes]; it absorbs everything. It has the right to regulate everything—morality, the arts, religion, the sciences; the individuals have no rights but by its leave. The pantheism of Hegel concentrates itself here in political pantheism. The state, the present god, is the sovereign invested with absolute rights. This apotheosis of the state can have the sympathies of political absolutists, to whatever camp, monarchic or democratic, they belong; but it is profoundly in antipathy to political liberty. In fine, the whole

philosophical conception of Hegel, with which his theory of rights and of the state is intimately allied, is rejected by conscience and reason. The idea of a God-progress, who develops himself across the world, in order to arrive at a clearer and clearer consciousness of himself, is a monstrous application of anthropomorphism, which transfers to God that which is found in finite and perfectible creatures. It is not the idea of God, of the infinitely and eternally perfect being, who is the sole foundation of the moral and religious sentiments of man." (Seventh edition of "*Droit Naturel*," vol. i., p. 75.)

From such a source few gleams of a light from Heaven could penetrate into the social state. Still fewer could come from an infidelity or atheism that has diffused itself among the workingmen, and which would not be averse to the reign of almost absolute will in the state, if it carried out the will of the masses. But now let us suppose the state established. Is there anything in an absolute state, whether called by the name of aristocracy or democracy, that is favorable to the growth of religion? If it should be entirely indifferent in regard to these interests, leaving them, as it naturally would, wholly to parents, shutting them out of schools, and making religion voluntary in the strictest sense; religious faith would have a poor chance, with such a start, with society against it, and with the state perfectly indifferent.

There is, indeed, nothing that we in the United States can find fault with in the declarations of the programme of Eisenach (1869) demanding separation of the Church from the state and of the school from the Church; or in the demand of the programme of Gotha (1875), that religion be declared a private matter. Nor could we altogether dissent from those at the Congress of Brussels (1868), who insisted "on the necessity of an obligatory and integral instruction—that is to say, one comprising both scientific instruction, separated from every religious idea, and professional instruction." But, as there would be no religious education in the public schools and none of any account in the largest part of the families; as religion at the start of the new state would be prostrate, with no ministers, perhaps without churches; as it must depend for its support on what workingmen could contribute from their certificates of daily work, minus what the government would need for its own uses, or on missionaries from lands where capital was still in private hands (who would be not very welcome agents), the prospects of any common worship, or of any enterprise among the few believers in Christianity, or of any hope of better things, as far as human eyes can discover, would be exceedingly small.

We will now consider somewhat together the relations of the socialistic state to marriage and

the family. Here we come to a part of our subject where the socialists complain that they have been misunderstood, and even maligned, by the friends of existing order. The Germans forget that the opinions of *Enfantin* and of *Fourier* must have made a deep impression, and that it is excusable sometimes to charge on a whole body what only a part of it felt and thought. Count *Gasparin*, perhaps, in his "*L'Enemie de la Famille*," is liable to this imputation. If *Fourier* gives us one kind of communistic system, *Cabet* gives us another. His doctrine looks toward a severe monogamy, and the amiable man's heart was evidently open to the pleasures of the family-circle. He honestly believes that "the inclination between parents and children, be it as lively as possible, will produce in a society organized on a plan of equality and community no one of the evils which, in the present system of inequality, it brings forth."

When, again, we draw a line between the small communistic societies and the socialistic state, it can be readily seen that the former must put the family in the background, while the other need not have this effect. Of this we have already spoken, and will only repeat the remark that the community, if small, supplies the place of the family; while in the social state there is no such cause hostile to the family's just place and influence; since the communities here are for indus-

trious purposes only, and nothing more than assemblages of workingmen, each for the most part having his own home there. Thus the privacies of the family, its separate loves and enjoyments and secrets, may there flourish, if no other causes besides the nature of the state prevent.

The question, however, will naturally be asked whether the abolition of inheritance will not act disastrously upon the interests of the family. As the socialistic state is built upon the destruction of family property, none can be transmitted, except those savings which take the form of mere personal enjoyments and can at the best be very small in amount. Whatever motives, therefore, drawn from the hope of leaving an inheritance to a wife and children, act upon men in society as it now is, to promote thrift and heighten family affections, nearly all these will be lost, when society shall suffer the changes which the socialists threaten. The wife of the workingman must look forward to a life of struggle for children yet helpless, or of greater discomfort and poverty. It is not, indeed, likely that the state would neglect the care of its helpless ones, for the abolition of inheritance would create an imperative demand for its aid. But, however that may be, the prospect that a life of work would at its end leave a family helpless, would tend, by a sort of law of society, to make marriage less desirable than it is now and less sacred. If, added to this,

religion should lose its hold, if materialism should prevail as the spirit of the community, as, without the counteraction of spiritual causes, it must, the society might become fearfully loose in its morals; worse than any similar collections of persons now; worse than ignorant Africans on Southern plantations, because now a sentiment from outside does act on every class of men to some extent, even down to the lowest.

We cannot doubt that the abolition of direct inheritance would cut off one of the strongest and least exceptionable motives which now stimulate industry, economy, and the domestic virtues. With this, of course, we include the claim of the wife to a portion of the husband's estate, which now law may enforce against his last will. If the unity of the family is a natural union, and if the permanence of the feeling of unity is a vast good to society for at least two generations; the hope, on the part of the father, when he dies, that he can benefit his family by his labors and savings, must act on his whole life, and aid in forming the best civic habits and virtues. Fix a maximum of landed property if you please, but do not attack the transmission of property, on which so much of the morality and welfare of the state depends.

With regard to the sanctity of the marriage tie and to its dissolution by divorce, the feelings of a community will hold a due proportion to those

which they hold in respect to the family and to the state of marriage. Jäger, in his "*Socialismus*," remarks that the possession of land and soil in common, if it arises out of materialism, leads also to community of wives, as being another expression of materialistic communism. This, however, is a tendency, but not a necessity. In an assembly of the German Workingmen's Union at Berlin, Hasenclever (one of Lassalle's friends and a member of the Reichstag) said that "when the spoliation (of the working class by the capitalists) should cease, then first prostitution would cease, and the woman be given back to her calling—to the education of children. The woman question would then be taken by the developed socialistic or, more correctly speaking, communistic state under its own control; for in this state, where the community bears the obligation of educating and maintaining the children, where no private capital subsists, but all instruments of production are common property, the woman needs no longer, out of respect to her children, to be legally chained to one man. The bond between the sexes will be simply a moral one; and then such a bond, if the characters did not harmonize, could be dissolved." Jäger (who appears to have given the sense of the words of Hasenclever, rather than the words themselves), then continues: "These words approach already pretty near to community of wives; but another

orator, Jörissen, expressed more openly the removal of all barriers, in saying that a maiden who disposed freely of her love was no prostitute—she was the free wife of the future. In the state of the future only love should direct the unions of the sexes. Between the married wife and the so-called prostitute there was only a quantitative difference. The children would necessarily belong to the state, and the state provide for both. These views did not exactly meet with full approbation; but they met with no opposition based on principle."

But it is not quite fair to argue from the expressions of unprincipled leaders of the socialistic parties in Germany what will be the feelings and the conduct of the rank and file when they get into the promised land. It is but just to say, that now, while they are under private employers and capitalists, they are careful to save women and children from overwork, and to put them under full protection of the law. Among the demands of the Gotha programme, "within society as it now exists," we find prohibition of work on Sunday, prohibition of children's work, and of all female work prejudicial to health and morality, with other regulations relating to the health of dwellings. They are, indeed, by no means the first that have moved in this direction. The English laws for the protection of women and children and for regulating the greed of

manufacturers in various ways—such as the restriction of the hours of work and a system of sanitary rules—may now be said to form a code, with supervisors appointed to carry out its provisions. The evils of manufacturing industry are in the same way calling, in later years, for similar legislation in the United States. Thus the law of compulsory schooling in some States imposes a penalty on manufacturers who employ children for such a length of time as would interfere with school-hours, and prevents parents from making money out of their children at the expense of their education. The humanity which is shown in programmes of socialistic parties did not, then, dawn upon the world with their formation; but in those countries where capital is strongest and labor comparatively most dependent, there the spirit of humanity, kindled by Christian faith, has been at work to oppose the spirit of selfishness, and to put down all the evils of society which arise from covetous disregard of rights, from parental neglect, from the feeling that material prosperity is the greatest of national interests. The socialists had better wait until this humanity of “capitalistic” countries gives up its voluntary efforts and its humane legislation. That will be a strong argument in favor of a new order of things.

In a socialistic state there might be education for all, reaching up into scientific truth; there

might be public festivities and amusements ; there might be a severe police against disorder and vice ; but I cannot see how the great institutions, which date from the earliest times of the world and appear everywhere in communities raised above savage life, can be secured from decay or how their place can be supplied.

IV.

RELATIONS TO SOCIETY CONCLUDED.

We have thus far briefly considered some of those results of socialism in its last and most practicable form, which flow from its despotic nature, or the union of social and political power in its political theory. We have also looked at it in its probable effects on the individual, on religion and the family. We have found, if I am not deceived, that it takes away from the individual some of the strongest motives which exist in civilized communities as they are now constituted ; that the father of a family could not rise above his condition or have any hope of rising, or of benefiting his family after his death, except to an extremely limited extent, by the results of his industry. We have seen that though the latest form of socialism is by no means hostile to the family, the conditions of a society under its control would by no means be favorable to the

health and warmth of family life. We have seen, also, that socialism, material and earthly in its spirit, dependent on irreligious men for its progress, supported by the voluntary contributions of the poor, would find it hard to keep its ground in the world.

We now proceed to consider a few points relating to public order, morality, and intelligence, so far as the form or spirit of socialism must affect them. And, first, as it regards security and quiet, it would have the same advantages over the present order of things which despotical states have over those where the individual has wide rights, and is little under control. The vast mass of persons would be confined, practically, to their abodes. There would be no tramps, no public beggars, and no strangers coming to steal, or do what is nearly as bad; for how could the former travel without tickets of work, or the latter pursue their trade, when there was nothing to steal. In fact, the eighth commandment would be far easier to keep than in society as it now is. The sixth commandment, too, might almost lie on the shelf; for if now a large part of the crimes of violence originate in desires for the property of others, they would be greatly diminished, when property should cease to be in private hands, or be in such a shape that it would be hard to seize or take away. Then a number of crimes, such as forgery, embezzlement, counterfeiting—all crimes in fact

against property, and many of those which injure the person, would be much limited in their sphere of operation.

And, owing to the same causes, the complaints of man against man, which are now brought before the courts, would greatly decrease in number. Where the state did all the business, there would be no private breaches of contracts; where inheritance was unknown, or nearly so, there would be no probate of wills or quarrels growing out of wills. Where the state did all the business of transportation, there could be no common carriers besides. And if an end were put to all these things, society evidently would return to a state of things in which lawyers, judges, and voluminous statutes would not be necessary. How far this simplification of life would be an indirect disadvantage by cutting off some of those causes on which the spice, variety, and spirit of life depends, I will not stop to inquire; but the direct good in several respects would be apparent.

Yet it is not at all certain how far the communities in the social state would be orderly or moral. Here several things are to be considered. What effect on morality will a state of things be likely to have, where there is no public opinion of a higher class, which now has, if no other, an imperceptible influence. Or must a higher class crush down an inferior, so that its tastes become the worse because it feels itself to be below opin-

ion ? It may be reasonably apprehended that if the workingmen of socialism should be able to support themselves—say by six hours' labor—their leisure would be a snare ; that beer or whiskey, quarrels and violence, with other kinds of vice, such as gambling, would be more rife than they are now. A despotical government, however, would find it not difficult to keep these things under control.

Another and a worse form of immorality, the crime of unchastity, would, one may fairly suppose, be peculiarly prevalent under socialistic institutions. For, as we have seen, the abolition of inheritance must deduct something from the importance attached to the family, and the low materialistic views with which socialism starts, must deduct something more ; nor can one discern anything in its institutions which is fitted to counteract these unhappy tendencies. Divorce, too, it is probable, would be granted on insufficient grounds, and marriage become an affair of convenience. A lower depth would be reached in regard to the domestic relations than that to which society in Christian lands has hitherto fallen, unless the social state should contend, as for its existence, against these adverse influences.

As a matter of course, the support of the poor, or more generally, of all who are incapable of labor, would fall upon the state. At present, property does this work by taxes and bequests,

and whatever Christian states and Christian society have failed to do, they cannot be blamed for indifference to the needs of the helpless and for want of humanity. In the social state voluntary contributions of the living, and bequests from the dead would be in great measure cut off; and the deductions from the products of work would be greater burdens, it is probable, than any now falling on the humbler classes of those who live by labor. Yet, it would seem to be feasible, if the state should use the proceeds of some of the "expropriated" lands under its control for the purpose of providing for the helpless and destitute. How the numbers of this class would compare with those in existing states, is not a problem to be easily solved. Some of the causes of distress, such as war, over-trading, and over-taxing, would be less; but general famines could not be met nor prevented as easily as now, when private trade can carry with ease the surplus food of one land to another which is suffering; while a social government could neither borrow money in a foreign land, nor send surplus manufactures there as easily as now. On the whole, the problems of poverty and bad harvests do not look as if they could be more easily solved than they are at present.

The education of the people, which states of the old type have so much neglected, or even dreaded and opposed, has been advocated in all sorts of social programmes. We have spoken of

the position which the International took on this point, and of the resolutions favoring compulsory education passed at Eisenach and Gotha (1869 and 1875), as well as insisting on gratuitous instruction in higher schools. Without question these expressions represent the earnest feeling of the socialists. But can the conditions of the state, or the current opinions of society always favor even a high grade of popular education? In states as they now are, the tendency is toward universal education: every class, even the humblest, in a large part of the United States, finds in it a source of hope and of advancement for the children of the class; and more than a few who have founded their own fortune, like Packer and Cornell, have established places of higher education for the benefit of posterity. Such benefactors, of course, will be wanting in social states, where no considerable properties can be accumulated; nor will the wages of laborers be sure to suffice for the payment of their children's schooling. Taxes, therefore, or deductions from tickets of work, will have to be levied upon all, and the interest of all will be to make education in common schools as cheap as possible. It may thus be imperfect, for the training necessary to become a teacher takes time, which must be paid for before the teacher begins his work. As for higher education, the demand for it will be less than now for several reasons. First, several of the

learned professions will be eliminated out of society, particularly lawyers and trained ministers, and with them the few who now have no business for life before them. There remain then chiefly physicians, who will be likely to be government employés, and all the many agents with various duties whom the government would want. Some of these would need a finished education in physical science; others would get along with one far less complete. But in regard to learning, especially of that kind which spends its force in discipline of the mind and in cultivation, æsthetical or intellectual, it is not easy to see what feeling there will be of the want of it, or what due estimate of its virtue, or ability to remunerate it to such an extent that it can have a healthful existence. Nor will the loss to learning be small when the upper classes, so-called, shall have to be wiped out of society; when those highly-trained persons who, in the state life of the present, give the tone and the standard to a nation, start thoughts which pervade society and bear fruit for all time; who keep up the feeling in a nation, that there is something better than material good things, and that cultivation of soul and mind is better than utilized results of knowledge. The presence of an opulent class in a country is much more for the good of those below them, than for their own, particularly in this matter of education; for if, as often happens, the rich have not the

energy or self-confidence to go forward in a course of hard thinking or of striving toward some ideal goal, they awaken others who would have slumbered amid empty hopes.

Can, then, a higher education or a high value put on common education—we may add, can æsthetical cultivation and skill—be natural growths of a society which gives up private property, which cuts off the principal demands for a learned class and the means of encouraging art and science?

APPENDIX.

In reference to the communist or social state we append, at the close of this Chapter, remarks of Baron J. Eötvös in his “Einfluss der herrschenden Ideen des 19 Jahrhundert auf dem Staat,” vol. i., ch. 11, p. 276 et seq., translated from his own German translation, 1854.

“I find the dislike with which in modern times communism and socialism have been attacked, very easy to be understood. Even the greatness of the danger which threatens our entire social order through these doctrines, explains the violence with which they are attacked. Yet men make a great mistake when they think that the dangers threatening us from this source can be warded off by the unmeasured accusations, or

wholly false assertions which are brought forward against socialism. Of all the charges thus laid to the account of socialism, there are none which were not once made against Christianity also."

He then proceeds to illustrate what he has said by the charges brought in the early centuries against Christianity, denies that there is an analogy between it and socialism, admits that the latter can make its doctrine suit the wants of men in society, and shows that it has controlled at least one large state, that of Peru under the Incas. Then he proceeds as follows (p. 183):

"But all this shows not that communism is altogether impossible, but only that it cannot subsist without absolutism; and it would be doing injustice to the communists to suppose that they themselves have not seen into this necessary consequence of their system. Not only have prominent teachers in the communistic school, but even those who have employed themselves in framing constitutions for Utopias, for the purpose of making a higher order of things possible among men, have acknowledged that an authority with all power vested in it, was, for this end, indispensable. That this power, according to the communistic theory, must be conferred by the free choice of the community, makes no essential difference in practice; since the right of choice, where no other franchise is left to the people, can be only of short duration; and communistic France, for

example, would renounce it with the same frivolous readiness with which republican France elected Napoleon consul for ten years, then for life, and at last chose him emperor. The right of free choice, moreover, rests on the right of free concurrence, and nothing can be said against this which cannot be maintained against that. How then, in a system, the highest, or rather only aim of which is the establishment of equality, and an organization in which universal peace is to be secured by the exclusion of everything which produces any kind of rivalry,—how under such conditions can the principle of free suffrage, which is in such open contradiction to two ends to be secured [equality and non-competition], be long maintained?

That which is essential in communism is not at all those single schemes, against which men take the field with great outlay of wisdom and learning. As Cabet, in his communistic profession of faith, expresses himself for the continuance of the family, whilst others hold the family to be inconsistent with the system of entire equality and the right of all to every enjoyment, so among the doctrines of communism hardly one is to be found concerning which the most important differences do not exist. The essentials of communism, in which all who adhere to it agree, consist rather in this—that complete equality is the end and object of the state, and the unconditional

subjection of the individual under the state is assumed to be the means to this end. As, now, such complete subjection of the individual under the state's power is only then possible, when despotic power is conceded to the state, and as there is the closest possible approach to this principle of universal equality, when only a *single person* is an exception to this [rule of equality]; it follows that despotism is not only not in contradiction to the principles of communism, but also that it is the necessary form of it, and is that form in which its principles can be most completely applied.

“Not the victory of communistic principles is impossible, but it is only impossible that these principles can be realized by any other means than a completely despotical power. The victory of communism must, therefore, at the same time, be the victory of despotism.”

Similar views to these of Eötvös may be found in other writers. We may be allowed to add here, as showing the vast increase of the state's power, if it should usurp the most important functions of society, that the exercise of force founded on the judgments of the state must constantly occur. Thus, there must be something like an equilibrium kept up between different kinds of work; work in the field must furnish adequate supplies for contemporaneous work in the manufactory and in other departments of life as

well as for itself. This equilibrium can be maintained only by restricting production, in some department where it would be an arbitrary and perhaps cruel act, or, if there was an absolute overproduction, by sending the surplus abroad. The question in every case, which is now settled by private persons, would belong to the state, and, as far as we can see, would involve the state in a most complicated set of adjustments. It might be necessary, if the amount of labor was too great in one branch, to transfer laborers to another branch, whether they could or wished to take the new labor on themselves or not. And to every grumbler, the answer would be, "You have an undivided ten-millionth right in the state, and have got to work. The state must judge for you how and where, and how long you must work."

APPENDIX II. to Chapter VII. (see page 235).

F. A. Lange, having been charged by von Sybel with being decidedly in favor of doing away with private property in land, replies as follows (*Arbeiterfrage*, ed. 3, note 8 to ch. vii., p. 403):

"I am in no way an unconditional adherent of community in land, but only an unconditional opponent of the prejudices prevailing in the country against this social thought. I regard commu-

nity in land as the right plan only in those parts where, on account of the inordinate extent of the *latifundia*, no private ownership of land exists as a thorough-going factor of social life, and determines the opinions and habits of the people—this above all in England. Yet even here I leave the possibility open of aiming at a satisfactory social reform, on the opposite plan of dividing the soil into small parcels, and of conveying it to small land-owners. In those countries, however, where small landed properties are found to a sufficient extent—such as France, Switzerland, and West Germany—it seems to me that community in the soil, properly speaking, even on account of the deep-rooted inclination of the people toward ownership of land, can have no chance of success. In such lands social progress is rather to be sought for, partly in free, coöperative, common industry of neighbors, partly in the reform of the credit-system. Under all circumstances, however, I am of the opinion that in all places where the true nature of private property in the soil is destroyed, and the right of property has become a bare means of levying tribute on foreign work, as it is especially in our large towns, it is very foolish to allow one's self to be scared away, by vague conceptions of the sacredness (*unantastbarkeit*) of the foundations of our society, from measures which properly, on unprejudiced reflection, must be acknowledged as the only right and

thorough ones. A law for the expropriation of property in towns, or, perhaps, still better, for the expropriation of ground-lots, within a girdle around the town which is not yet built upon, I would rather have passed to-day than to-morrow; and should be sure that this small step toward community in the soil must needs be accompanied with the most beneficial consequences, if carried out from the beginning onward, in a somewhat reasonable way, and without any compulsion in making transfers."

He then proceeds to say that the "plan of turning the present landholders into leaseholders of public domains, has one of its most essential points left wholly in the dark—that is, the eventual termination of the lease [*Kündigung der Pacht*]. Without doubt the day after issuing such a universal law of expropriation, the proprietors would at once, and in a body, find themselves in the condition of lessees of their own soil; and for this great change a payment of equitable damages would be held out in prospect—which, indeed, in the case of a violent revolution, might be forgotten; yet the intention would not at all be in this transfer of property to stop with a lease-system. The plan would rather be that the state should now, according to the measure of what necessity required, and of economical practicability, give the land on lease to those who would themselves cultivate it, and especially in the way of associated

or coöperative work. A law, however, by virtue of which in Germany the *latifundia* (only not all at one blow) should be expropriated and given to rural workingmen on lease, I should unhesitatingly regard as a good one, although here the difficulties in carrying out would be greater than in the case of the towns."

Such are the views of a political economist who has decidedly social leanings, but does not belong to the party of the socialists. He would make property in land within, or near towns, public, which was fit or likely to be used in building houses intended for rent; and he would pass on from the expedient of converting landholders into leaseholders under the state, to the ultimate method of having the leases of such a sort that the land should be cultivated by coöperative industry. But *latifundia* (and how much land would be needed to constitute a *latifundium* he does not say) he would have taken from their proprietors.

The plan of the author, taken as a whole, to be applied in Germany and England, but not practicable in France and Switzerland, labors exceedingly. It is necessary that all houses and lots in cities, as well as houses for rent, if any, should belong to the state. It is necessary too, as it seems to the writer, that socialism must be universal, or must be the source of universal confusion. Yet the safety of the state and of private

property seems to demand that large landed estates must be somehow or other broken up, and the number of persons owning the soil be greatly increased in those countries where now the landlords are comparatively few ; and that as speedily as economic rules will allow. And this ought to be made permanent.

CHAPTER VIII.

I.

IS THE OVERTHROW OF THE PRESENT FORM OF SOCIETY
BY SOCIALISM PROBABLE?

Is socialism a mere Utopia, or can it be realized in the world—if not by persuading men of its truth, yet, in the last resort, by revolutionary violence? Can it get the power of the state into its hands in the United States; or may we treat its boasts on European soil as mere bluster, and much more so when they talk of victories for its cause on our side of the Atlantic? Or, if there is no real danger, is there revealed in this agitation a social disease which calls for a cure? And if so, what cure can be applied? To the first of these questions I intend to devote what remains, according to my plan, to be said upon the subject of socialism; yet not without the hope of being able to suggest a few thoughts relating to a cure of the disease in society of which this is a symptom.

If we go to the bottom of things, the strength of socialism—that which takes hold of the great

mass of the party—is not argument; but the demand for equality, which has been called forth in modern times by new views of political rights and by the concession of rights to those who had either no rights, or incomplete ones before. The new views led to the new demands; and these seemed so just, or it was felt to be so necessary to comply with them, that one privilege after another was broken down; political equality was carried out extensively; and civil rights were made the same, or nearly the same for all. But the feeling of inequality was met by a fact as old as freedom—inequality of condition. Some members of society, whatever may have been the cause—whether it were birth, or education, or superior abilities, or better judgment, or what men call happy accidents—gained wealth or comforts which were beyond the reach of others; and this more advantageous position was made permanent by laws and usages on which society was conceived to rest, such as free individual movement in matters of business, the security of property and its transmission by inheritance. Moreover, the progress of improvements in the great departments of labor demanded a concentration of capital, which made it harder than before for a man without capital to rise above the level assigned to him by birth. Thus equality of rights was practically counteracted, or made worth but little for great numbers in society by the consequences

of freedom. Equality of rights was met by inequality of condition, which seemed to be growing more marked and striking, as business, in order to be managed with the more success, required larger capital. Thus society seemed to have a disease fastened upon it as bad as that which infested it before the new equality of rights began; and those who indulged in political speculations, out of sympathy or of dissatisfaction with the present, looked for a remedy. The evils of the social system, they said—its poverty, its caste-like proletariat, its plutocracy, all growing and growing by a kind of law—are due to unrestricted private enterprise. The remedy must be found in transferring all capital to the state. This train of thought, when unfolded to men who wanted something better for themselves, and accompanied by plausible theories of a new condition of industry under the control of the state alone, is socialism.

It deserves to be remarked that the feeling of equality worked in another channel also. In the older times, when there were few general workshops, and men worked in their own abodes, or when workshops were small and this craving for equality did not press upon the laborers' minds, the master and the workmen got along very well together; but now, when great workshops and great capital are needed, the employer is a magnate, quite above the former position of his office

relatively to his workmen. This makes the distance between the two the greater, and the new feeling of equality makes it seem to be the greater. Men submit to power which comes from above or is impersonal; but they chafe under the personal power of a man on the same political level with themselves. Hence, they would submit to the state's direction, if it took all industry into its hands, rather than to an undertaker or employer who is their equal in civil and political society.

From these sources come the advantages which the socialists have in carrying out the plans of their parties. From these sources I say, and from baseless promises and theories of rights touching the returns of labor, which the workingmen rather believe than understand. The workingman thinks that he can lose nothing, if Bebel or Liebknecht is no prophet. He can gain something if what they say is true. The world, in any case, needs him. But there is another and a very considerable portion of society which knows that the success of socialism is the ruin of themselves and their families. How are they to be placated or put asleep? Not, certainly, by those violent denunciations against the "*bourgeoisie*," which many socialists use, with the effect only of irritating that class and of alienating one class from another. But for this policy, the "*bourgeoisie*" might underrate the resources and the proba-

bility of success of the social movement; but now they are gradually taught that it means nothing less than their ruin, their extinction as a class, their having their property taken from them, and their reduction to the order of state workmen.

Nothing, in fact, but persuasion or violent revolution can lead holders of property in a country, however small it be, to acquiesce in so complete an overturning of society, and downfall of themselves, as the most modern socialism contemplates. Let us look at this alternative, and especially at the probable success of the social doctrine.

One very important article of this new faith is that a law of nature—if so it can be called—is working on its side. The present is the age of complicated machinery, superseding the instruments which formerly a single man could own, and of vast amounts of capital in individual hands. But the change from the plan of small and domestic industry to the present wholesale industry is only a stage in the progress. As the housewife working at her loom in odd hours has given way to the tenants of mammoth manufactories, so the small and less powerful of these manufactories must give way to the more powerful. The larger the scale of these operations, the fewer must be the employers. And the same is true of capitalists. They, too, must dwindle in number while they swell in size. Then they become an

easier prey to those whom the system has made serfs, but to whom constitutions give liberty.

I have touched on this before ; but I touch on it now again to say, *first*, that, if any such law, fatal and inevitable, is at work, its progress must be measured not by years, but by centuries. The socialists have done existing order a favor by calling to it the attention of men. There is time to decide whether it is an essential evil, which nothing but violent surgical methods can cure, or one which society, once convinced of its existence and growth, can remove without destroying itself. If, even in this country, unfettered freedom can bring about a state of things in which a few great merchants, manufacturers, ship-owners, transporters, and money-lenders shall absorb the capital of the country, it will then be the time to rectify the evil, if it can be done, by appropriate legislation. Meanwhile, we will live in hope of something less radical than the destruction of society in order to destroy the evils growing out of private capital.

And, *again*, I doubt very much whether the socialists can persuade men that the additional value, conferred by the labor of operatives on materials put into their hands, wholly belongs to them, so that they are plundered by their employers, when they are paid on the present system. Nor will men, I imagine, be made to see that the state can compensate in a way, or to an amount,

unlike which is current in the present day. For both state and employer pay for all the instruments of production and the material to be worked up; both make advances to the laborer before the product comes into market; both, in reality, pay their own expenses, by sale of the manufactured articles; only, if the goods sell at a loss, the employer bears the loss, in the one case, while, in the other, the state throws the loss on the whole number of the laborers in the country. And, after all this, the state, having nothing wherewith to pay its expenses save the products of labor, takes a part, it may be a considerable part, of these products (*i. e.*, as we have seen, of the tickets of time representing them), for its expenses and those of its numberless agents. Which of these processes is best for the laborer, and gives him the greater share of the proceeds it may be reasonably doubted.

Nor is it so evident that labor done for the state will be more effective and hearty than that done for a private employer, when the system seems to be built on the amount of average labor or the number of hours' work as the divisor, and on the gross amount of products as the dividend. As we have had occasion to remark already, this is a cardinal point. The private employer has the remedy in his hands; but in the socialistic state the workmen may all be paralyzed by the system, and there may be found to be such a want

of motive as to lower the amount of products much below what it ought to be. If this should be the case, it would be fatal to the whole theory of social work. Until the socialists can show that it is not, men whom they wish to convert to their theory will hesitate long before they admit it.

Yet *again*, if the socialists should adhere so rigidly to their present scheme of work, which is the foundation of the entire system, as to pay no regard to the demand for specific articles, but only to the amount of labor incorporated in them, and should fail to provide for the mobility of laborers, they would not persuade men that their system could be stable and prosperous. Unless it can accommodate itself to the changing fashions and wants of the community, as the present system of industry does with the quickness of a social barometer—if we may so express ourselves—many will believe that it must collapse. Other states may suffer terrible disasters, and recover from them by means of private enterprise; but the social state commits itself to one line of action, from which it cannot deviate and on which there is no going back. At least, this would be an apprehension which would make many slow in consenting to its exclusive control.

But, after all, political economy and the interests of work by no means make up the whole of life. There will be multitudes who may have very little knowledge on such points, who yet will

ask how socialism will affect the individual, the family, the government, morals, religion, and all spiritual and moral forces, about which the socialists seem to care little. Unless these can be satisfied that the character of the people to which they belong—taking that term in its widest extent—will not be deteriorated by social institutions, they will not readily join in pulling down existing ones, which, with all their defects, encourage much that is noble in life and manners.

And in this feeling many socialists will join; for the breach with all the thoughts and habits of ancient society will be so entire, there will be such a divorce from history and the past, that many, to whom the question of work is not the all-absorbing one, will be unable to bring themselves to participate in the social revolution, or even to wish it success.

It seems certain, then, that the change in society must be effected, if effected at all, by violence. If the socialists should not wish to appeal to violent measures, such an appeal would come from the partisans of existing society. The advantage in such an appeal would at first be greatly in favor of established order; for, as the socialists have always shown the conviction that their question is not national, but universal, so the anti-socialists, of all political shades and national antipathies, will, as a matter of course, join their forces, for it is a question of self-preservation. *Tua res agitur,*

paries cum proximus ardet. The spirit of internationalism would then pervade all nations; for not only changes in government, but a wholesale destruction of property, would be involved in the struggle. Nor could there be any compromise, unless social principles on the part of the enemies of present society were abandoned—that is, unless the struggle came to be one for the mere rule of society and for spoils. The socialists could accept of no such issue or they would meet with certain ruin; for their principles are their only strength. Now, in such a contest, it is not at all likely that the outbreak would be simultaneous everywhere in a circle of nations. It is not even likely that socialism would be so strong in all of them as to feel itself everywhere equal to the measures of violence which would be necessary. There would be, then, an advantage on the side of existing order. Government and property, where they were strong, could aid the forces of society where the socialists were strong. The separate states in Europe, for instance, so often opposed in war to one another, would then be united against the foes of existing order. Could the result be doubtful? Property and capital would be on one side, and a large proletarian mass on the other, without supplies or credit; able to do vast mischief, without question, but not able to gain their end;—no nearer to the time when all men with hands would be either the agents or the workingmen of the state,

The socialistic party is, perhaps, encouraged by the seeming apathy of a large part of society in regard to their ultimate plans. But they can hardly believe that all who are not against them are for them. It takes a long time for many persons to conceive that any body of men really desire and are doing their best to bring about the greatest of changes—not to reform nor to transform, but to overthrow and build up again on a new foundation. To others the project seems an idle, Utopian scheme, from which sober men, who are attracted by some of its features, will in the end withdraw. To others still it may seem that a party, the basis of which is political economy, has too narrow and uncertain a foundation for any success at first or stability afterward; although they ought to be aware that political economy is putting questions which make differences between parties, and between nations; and has almost reached the place occupied heretofore by doctrines of personal liberty and of the nature of government. But, if the social movement makes much further progress, these persons will see that they must form an opinion on the great point at issue, and it cannot reasonably be doubted which side they will take.

FUTURE PROSPECTS OF SOCIALISM.

Manufacturing industry on a large scale, by gathering many workingmen together, aids their united action and gives rise to a general opinion which is often tyrannical and overlooks the rights of others. As workingmen are brought into close contact with one another and to a degree are separated from their fellow-men, they are compacted into a class which stands over against capitalists and over against the general community. The ease with which they can be acted on by reformers and agitators gives them a false sense of their relative importance; and, owing to the facility of their concerted action, while other classes cannot readily unite, they throw other classes into the background. Socialistic influences have had little effect hitherto on those tillers of the soil who are not owners of land—such as farm-laborers and tenants of small farms, a numerous class in some countries where, greatly to the detriment of society, land is owned in large masses. If the agitation now so rife in parts of Europe should have the effect of subdividing the large estates and of converting tenants into proprietors, it would be a blessing for all time. At present many of this class might be led to sympathize

with socialism, if they could be reached by its emissaries. But, for a time, they would only count on its rolls; they would have little weight.

Over against the workingmen are placed by the socialists the *bourgeoisie*, or third class, which consists of all who have property, whether invested in their business, or kept as a provision for their own and their families' support. This class touches the proletarian class, which has only daily work for its dependence. Yet even this distinction from others of the *bourgeoisie* often disappears, as in the case of a man who lives by manual labor, deposits his surplus earnings in a savings-bank, and at length is able to buy a house or land. Some of its members, again, may envy others who have superior wealth, and on this side may be open to socialistic influences; yet many others know well that the interests of all with whom they do business are closely linked together. They are well aware that no industrious class, which does not live on social vice and is permanent, can be otherwise than helpful to the other classes of society; and so their maxim is, if they are prudent and temperate: "Live and let live."

"The nature of the modern state presses toward the obliteration of class distinctions." So says an eminent German, Heinrich von Treitschke. This is true, because legislative power is not confined to the upper classes or their repre-

sentatives ; because education runs wider through and further down the stratification of society than formerly ; because the noble class, where it remains, has become relatively weaker ; and because there are examples of states with no political gradations and where social differences are not aided by law.

The socialistic agitation strives to keep up the feeling of class distinctions. Logically, and by way of definition, we may say that one who has nothing laid up and works with his hands belongs to one class ; and a man who owns his tools of trade and has direct connection with those who want his products, belongs to another. A man who cuts kindling wood with a sawing-machine, and is the owner of a horse and wagon, has capital and works also ; he must, therefore, be ranked with the "bourgeoisie"—with capitalists, for instance, who own instruments of production, and do not generally work with their hands. It is striking that no word has been coined in English or in German to represent this word and the other French word, *proletariat*. Does not this show that there was no real use for their existence, until the socialists began to draw a wide line of separation between these two conditions of society ?

The question may now be put : "What is and must be the feeling of this class toward the project of a socialistic state, when they begin to comprehend its nature and meaning ?"

1. The essential characteristic of this portion of the community is that they own property which is the means of production ; and we cannot separate from them their helpers, of various names— journeymen, apprentices, clerks, porters, domestic servants, all the officials of public corporations, and the like—who, if they are not proprietors, may become such, and who know the value of property as an institution of society. Men may talk as they please about the evils of individualism and of a society founded on the selfish principle ; but after all there are two poles of human nature and society, which are both necessary :— that the human being should feel himself to be a separate entity, and that he should belong to a body as one of its members. Neither the varieties of human character, nor independence and enterprise, nor any of the higher practical virtues of our nature could exist without giving free scope to individuality ; that is, to freedom. The family furnishes a sphere for the exercise of both principles, and thus harmonizes the two tendencies of man. Socialism fetters individuality, and restricts the free choice of a career and the procurement of objects for gratifying the tastes and desires. This it does by almost destroying private property. It will not be strange, therefore, if all who have property, small or great in amount, shall stoutly oppose socialism, as being opposed to the free development of personality.

This feeling is as strong in the poor man who has property, as in the rich. A man may be satisfied with a small amount of property; but that amount is precious. A benevolent man may value the privilege of acquiring property by means which he has chosen; though he gives it away as fast as he makes it. The feeling is in all men.

The feeling, however, seems to be particularly strong *in owners of land*. The connection of a farmer with his farm is more a love than a rational estimate. It is like our love for our country, founded on numberless events in the past which may now be forgotten. If everything which we own gives us a gratification as being ours, the ownership of the soil adds also to our feeling of importance. There is a portion of the earth's surface where we have exclusive control, which we may forbid any one to enter upon, as we may shut the rest of the world out of our houses.

Now can any one expect that a free cultivator, who determines for himself what he shall raise, what shall be wood-land, what shall be pasture-land, who pleases himself by planting and planning for years to come—can any one expect that such a man will willingly surrender his acres to the state, leaving it to the state thenceforth to direct how they are to be manured and tilled and what part of the crop shall be his? The most accepted kind of socialistic cultivation of land

is by means of associations under state agents. Is it credible that an owner of a farm would willingly surrender it to the state and work for the state, getting his tickets of hours' labor and having nothing to do with the choice of crops or the method of cultivation; taking, indeed, what his wants require for the day or week, but reckoning for everything as a fiduciary or a serf? To me, at least, it is incredible. He would regard it as a sinking down into serfdom.

Nor is it more probable that a man thus dispossessed would be satisfied, at least in this country, with arguments adduced to show that he has no title, in justice, to his fields. "If the state ever had a title," he would say, "that title was conveyed to those from whom I derived it, and motives were held out to them to take the lands offered for sale; the land offered and received was meant to be transferred in perpetuity; constitutions and laws have confirmed the transferred land, which has now become mine, as much as the state can make it mine. The United States have parted by gift, or at a small price, with many millions of acres to settlers; and would be bound, if a state of the Union were disposed to seize on the lands of its citizens, to resist and put down such attempts; for the lands were either sold by the general government before the state existed, or the right to them was retained, or it was parted with to the new states and conveyed by them to settlers. In

any case, the property, the state's power of selling over again, or of taking back, or of restricting sales by settlers, was parted with forever; and if such power should be usurped by the state the courts of the Union might be authorized to interfere. Indeed, such attempts by one of the states, imbued with socialistic principles, might provoke other states, if lands of their citizens were invaded and 'expropriated,' to complain and to resent the wrong. Until, therefore," he would say, "the Federal Constitution and that of each and every state shall be altered so as to conform to the socialistic model, I may be quite sure of having powerful protectors against public as well as private invaders of my rights. If the United States attempted to do this, the state would resist; if a state attempted it, the United States would bring the wrong before its tribunals. And, possibly, another of the states would endeavor to redress the wrong done to one of its own citizens."

In countries with a less complicated form of government it might be easier, as far as the opposition from the classes interested in preserving the existing order of things could be counted on, to carry out the programme of destroying the individual right of property, especially of landed property; but everywhere attempts to "socialize" all institutions will be met by determined resistance.

2. And that this resistance would in many countries be effectual; that socialism, if it should

attempt violent revolution, would be put down, is made probable by the strength and resources of the conservative part of society—that is, of those who can be united in preserving and defending private property. We may, I believe, lay it down that the agricultural class in all countries which raise their own food must constitute full one-half of the population. In France, some years since, when the population was estimated to be about thirty-seven millions, the holders of lands amounted to 6,000,000, who, with their families, would make up considerably more than half of the inhabitants. This, indeed, includes owners of houses in towns, as well as in the country, together with a number of tenants; but the small landholders are the largest class in the country. In the United States, according to the last census of 1870, the number of males in all occupations was just over twelve millions and a half. Of these nearly six millions belonged to the agricultural class and 2,707,421 were engaged in manufacturing and mining industry. Under the head of the professional and personal class 2,684,793 were counted, and under that of trade, commerce, and transportation 1,191,238. A part of this last description of persons might join in socialistic movements, and a few of those pertaining to the other classes; but we should probably go far beyond the truth if we admitted that one-third of the people might be won over to the socialistic side.

In the Scandinavian countries, and in Russia, since the abolition of serfdom, the part of the population which could be affected by socialistic movements must be small. The same is true of Southwestern Germany, although to a less extent.

In Great Britain the showing is not so favorable for the stability and order of existing society. In the Financial Reform Almanac for 1879, the number of persons in the professional classes is stated to be about six hundred and eighty-four thousand; in the commercial classes, 815,000; in the agricultural classes 1,657,000; in the industrial, 6,140,000, including persons engaged in manufacturing employments, shopkeeping, etc., of whom 1,770,000 are women; and in the domestic classes 5,905,000, of whom all but 244,728 are females, who are principally household servants. From these data we may with some confidence, if not with certainty, infer that operatives in manufacturing employments, greatly outnumber agricultural workers; and it is probable that the latter could not be relied upon in a contest between capital and labor. The number of small landowners is far less than in France or the United States, in proportion to the acreage of the kingdom. Yet the aids in preventing social disorganization—such as colonization and the readiness with which the governing classes have for a long time met the wants and the demands of the people—must not be left out of account. The

temper of the nation is not decidedly aristocratic, and classes have not had that embittered spirit toward each other which shows itself in portions of the Continent; so that the principles of rank socialism, notwithstanding or, rather, on account of the freedom of speech and the press, have taken little hold of Great Britain.

3. It seems to the writer, also, that the socialists undervalue the means and power of combination of the classes which are naturally opposed to them, as much as the thinking men of these classes undervalue the force of the arguments for a social change, and the hold which socialistic arguments have already gained, and are likely to gain in the future over the minds of the working classes. The towns, the arenas of the new agitation, feel their strength unduly and despise the country, where ideas move slowly because men live apart. But this is a grievous error. If they cannot get the country people to act on their side—to give up their farms and houses and domestic animals to the state, and receive daily work for daily wages as the state's laborers—their cause is lost. And that they cannot have this art of persuasion everything seems to show. If they think that because the workingmen are with them they can conquer the country, they will be grievously deceived. The cultivator of the soil can do without the manufacturing laborers more easily than these without them.

If, however, that to which we have referred already more than once should be found to be a law of social progress—that the free use of private property must end in making a few capitalists of enormous wealth and a vast population of laborers dependent on them; and if there could be no choice but between this disease of free society and the swallowing up of all property by the state—then, we admit, it would be hard to choose between the two evils. Nothing would lead the mass of men to embrace socialism sooner than the conviction that this enormous accumulation of capital in a few hands was to be not only *an evil in fact*, if not prevented, but a *necessary evil*, beyond prevention. We have no desire to see a return of the time of the “*latifundia*,” or broad farms, which, as Pliny the Elder said, were the ruin of Italy. If such a tendency should manifest itself, it would run through all the forms of property. A Stewart or a Claflin would root out smaller tradespeople. Holders of small farms would sink into tenants. The buildings of a city would belong to a few owners. Small manufacturers would have to take pay from mammoths of their own kind or be ruined. Then would the words of the prophet be fulfilled: “Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the earth.” For, if this went to an extreme in a free country, the “expropriated”

could not endure it. They would go to some other country, and leave these proprietors alone in the land, or would drive them away. A revolution, slow or rapid, would certainly bring about a new order of things.

But the danger of convulsions, or even of an overthrow of existing society, does not arise from any inevitable law, involving the loss of individual freedom, or impairing the strength of the family principle. The legislation of England within the present century—defending the weak against the strong, protecting the health of operatives, guarding women and children against overwork, providing for the reference of disputes between employer and workman to arbitrators, allowing unions and combinations between the workmen for carrying out their plans, giving them a larger interest and right in political affairs—shows what an enlightened nation can do when social evils become alarming. And if the difficulties attending the free sale of landed properties in small parcels could be removed, there can scarcely be a doubt that a land-owning peasantry would be another strong force on the side of the stability of public institutions. But our fears do not proceed from any belief that governments on the existing foundations of individual freedom cannot go on reforming, while yet they remain true to the principle of individual freedom. These fears arise from the influence, now

manifest, of a low sort of unprincipled or fanatical demagogues; from the insobriety of workingmen; from the decay of religious faith, and the sure weakness of moral principle and the instability of social habits without this great regulator. Our hopes point (in the United States at least), to the conditions and tendencies of society; to the continual parcelling of estates among heirs; to the opening to all classes, by the facilities of education, of all positions and employments. And when we think of the materialistic and even atheistic dogmas, which hide the face of God from so many of the poor, we are consoled by the faith that the religion of Christ can never die, that it can revive a nation at its lowest ebb of prosperity. The present century, more than any age before, has tested the power of Christianity to propagate itself through all the races of mankind. Even now it is showing its humane countenance to the gloomy and rancorous communists of France, like a new friend, having nothing to do with state polity, but only with reforming the inner man, and in fact coming from abroad. If this friend of man can work in its own legitimate way, the peace of society will be restored, and whatever opposes the best interests of any portion of society must come to an end.

INDEX.

Ahrens, 251.

Amana, communities at. See Inspirationists.

American communities, 50-84. See Shakers; Rapp; Harmony; Zoarites; Amana Inspirationists; Perfectionists; Oneida; Wallingford; Brotherhood of Common Life.

Anabaptists of Münster, 42-50; fanaticism of the sect at first, 42; opinions, 43; Thomas Münzer, 43; Rottmann at Münster, 45; Anabaptists get possession of the city, 46; Matthys and John of Leyden, 47, 48; the latter becomes king, 49; new constitution of the city, 47, 48; siege of it, and destruction of the leaders, 49, 50.

Antonelli, concerned in Babœuf's conspiracy, 103.

Aristotle, his criticism on Plato's republic, 87, 89.

Atkinson, Edward, on the share of the product going to the owner of capital, 169.

Babœuf, his conspiracy in 1796, 102-105.

Bakunin, a Russian Nihilist, his adventures, 147; his opinions, *ibid.*; forms an atheistic section in the International, 149; expelled with the section, on the ground of forming a secret society, *ibid.*

Bazard, a scholar of St. Simon, 107; breaks with *Enfantin*, 111.

- Blanc, Louis, his career and writings, 122, 123 ; the ateliers, 123 ; a losing experiment, 124 ; he defends the family, but not inheritance, *ibid.* ; his importance in the progress of socialism, 125.
- Boruttau, his atheism, 247.
- Brissot de Warville, 10, 102.
- Brotherhood of the New Life, 81-84.
- Brown, Thomas, his charges against the Shakers, 56, 57.
- Buchez, a disciple of St. Simon, 112.
- Buddhist mendicant order, 26-29.
- Buonarotti, concerned in Babœuf's conspiracy, 104 ; published the plan in 1828, *ibid.*
- Cabet, Etienne, his career, 118 ; his "Voyage to Icaria," *ibid.* ; his colony in the United States, *ibid.* ; unsuccessful, and why, *ibid.*, 69 ; his opinions, especially his communistic creed, 119-122 ; humane and averse to force, 121.
- Cairnes, Prof., cited, 170.
- Campanella, his life, 93 ; his "City of the Sun," 93-95 ; his chief magistrate a religious autocrat, 95 ; loose as to marriage, *ibid.*
- Collectivism, definition, 4 ; a French term, used also by Germans, *ibid.*
- Commune in Paris, 1870, 154-158.
- Communism defined, 1, 2, 7 ; other definitions, 12.
- Communities in the United States, conclusions concerning them, 67-72.
- Community of goods in the early Christian church, 34-37 ; voluntary, local, temporary, *ibid.*
- Constant, the Abbé, his communistic ideas, 116.
- Dalai Lama, in Thibet, 29.
- Davis, Mr. J. Bancroft, on the socialistic voters in Germany, 190.
- Diognetus, epistle to, cited, 36.

Dupont, E., Secretary of the International, 139, 143, 153.
 Dwight, Dr., on the Shakers, 56, 57.

Eisenach, programme of the social Democratic Workingmen's Party there (in 1869), 183-186.

Enfantin, a disciple of St. Simon, 109; his idea of marriage, 110-111.

Egypt, home of the Therapeutæ, 32; and of the earliest monks, 37.

Eötvös, Baron J., on the essential despotism of socialism, 267-271.

Equality, influence of the feeling of, for socialism, 277-279.

Equals, conspiracy of the, 102. Comp. Babœuf.

Esquiros, a religious communist mentioned, 116.

Essenes, 29-31; time of first appearance, 29; authorities for, 30; Dr. Lightfoot on, *ibid.*; number of, in Judea, *ibid.*; doctrines and practices of, *ibid.*

Fourier, his principal works, 113; not fully a communist in principle, *ibid.*; sought to make work agreeable, *ibid.*; his phalanxes and phalansteries, 114; his fantastic notions, *ibid.*; immoral views, 115.

Gotha, union there of the Workingmen's Union, and Workingmen's Party, 187; a virtual extinction of the former, *ibid.*; programme of Gotha (1875), 187-190.

Harmonist community, 61, 75, 76. See Rapp.

Harris, T. L., founder of Brotherhood of New Life, his views, 81-83.

Hasenclever, a social democrat, on marriage, 257.

Hatzfeld, Countess of, 173; relations to Lassalle, 173, 174; head of a branch of the Social Democratic Party after his death, 182.

Hinds, on American communism, 74-84.

Inheritance, discussions on, at Congress of Basel, 144-146 ;
L. Blanc's opinion as to, 124 ; relations to the family,
255, 256.

Inspirationist communities, 64, 65, 78-80. Comp. Amana.

International, or International Workingmen's Society, 126-158 ; its forerunners and preparations, 126-132 ; founded at London in 1864, 133, 134 ; principal founders, 132, 133 ; Mazzini, 133 ; rules, 134, 135 ; spread, 136, 137 ; others, besides workingmen, members, 138 ; congresses at Geneva, 138, 139 ; Lausanne, 139-141 ; Brussels, 143, 144 ; Basel, 144-146 ; schism in Switzerland, see Bakunin ; Franco-Prussian war delays congresses, 146 ; congress at the Hague, 149, 150 ; difficulties of the International, 150-152 ; bitterness of the leading members, 152, 153 ; it had no direct part in the horrors of 1871 at Paris, 155, 156 ; yet the general committee excused them, 157, 158 ; was injured in its influence by the events at Paris, 158, 159.

Jäger, his "Moderne Socialismus" often cited and much used, 10, 133, 248, 257, etc.

John of Leyden, or Jan Bockelson. See Anabaptists, 44-50.

Jörissen, a social democrat, on marriage, 258.

Josephus on the Essenes, 30.

Lamennais, his communistic ideas, 115.

Land, problems concerning, in a socialistic state, 235.
Comp. Lange.

Lange, F. A., extract from his "Arbeiterfrage" on the abolition of private property in land, 271-275.

Lassalle, life and character of, 171, 172 ; great abilities of, and works, 173-175 ; relations to Countess of Hatzfeld, 173, 174 ; his "Workingmen's Programme," 176 ; founds the German Workingmen's Union, 176 ; his vast exertions, 177, 178 ; death, 179 ; to what extent a socialist, 179, 180 ; his "iron law" of wages, 180 ; examined, 181 ; his productive associations, 179.

- Lee, Anne, foundress of the Shakers, 53-55.
- Leroux, Pierre, separated from *Enfantin*, 112; his theosophism, 117; his opinions, as stated by two of his scholars, 117, 118; on the decay of faith in France, 245, 246.
- Liebknicht, an early communist, 132; founder, with *Bebel*, of the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party, 183.
- Lightfoot, Dr., now Bishop, on the *Essenes*, referred to, 30.
- Mably, followed *Plato*, 97; changed his views, *ibid.*; stopped halfway in his communism, 97, 98; mistake as to *Sparta*, *ibid.*
- Marechal, a ferocious member of the "Equals," 104.
- Marriage, in *Plato's* republic, 89; in *Enfantin's* scheme, 110; *Cabet* and *L. Blanc* defend it, 119, 124; German socialists not loose on this point, in their theory, 254; their system tends to weaken the relation, 256-258.
- Marx, Karl, a socialist in early life, 130; a fugitive on account of his opinions, *ibid.*; finally, a kind of exile in London, *ibid.*; principal founder of the International, 133; a Hegelian in his philosophy, 161; his work on "Capital," *ibid.*; obscurity of his views, *ibid.*; takes for granted the injustice of private property, 164; his leading doctrine, that all increased value of material belongs to the laborer examined, 165-171; his atheism, 247.
- Mazzini, present at the first meeting of the International, 133; had not much in common with the socialists, *ibid.*
- Mehring, his "Social Democracy" cited, 174, 189, 191, 192, and elsewhere.
- Mill, J. S., on the remuneration of capital, 169; his chapters on socialism, a summary of, controverts the doctrine that the pressure of population on subsistence must always be growing more severe, 195; denies that wages are low and tend to fall, 194; thinks that the socialist notion of the workings of competition is imperfect, 195, 196; taxes them with misapprehension as to the share of the product taken by capital, 197; speaks of the diffi-

- culties of socialism, 198, 199 ; admits the possibility of its being the best form of society at some future day, 200.
- More, Sir T., his *Utopia*, 89-92.
- Morelly, his "Code of Nature," 99 ; long unnoticed, *ibid.* ; to what his influence has been due, 100 ; his fundamental laws of society, 100, 101.
- Most, J., his faith in the productiveness of labor in a social state, 22.
- Monastic orders, 37-41 ; monk and hermit compared, 40.
- Münster, Anabaptists of. See Anabaptists.
- Münzer, Thomas, 42, 43.
- Mutualism, from the French, 1 ; sense of the word, 4.
- Nordhoff, Charles, his work on the communistic societies of the United States often cited, 53-66.
- Noyes, J. H., founder of the communities of Perfectionists, his "History of American Socialisms" cited, 52, 65, 66 ; his essential modification of his system in 1879, 73, 74.
- Oneida Community. See Perfectionists ; Noyes.
- Owen, R., 52, 61 ; failure of his communities in the United States, *ibid.* ; causes of the failure, 69.
- Pachomius, in Egypt, devises a union of Anchorites, 38.
- Perfectionists, of Oneida and Wallingford, their opinions and practices, 65, 66 ; modifications in their practice in 1879, 73, 74.
- Philo the Jew, on the Essenes, 31 ; on the Therapeutæ, 32, 33.
- Plato, his republic, 85-89 ; was it an "idea" ? 87.
- Pliny the Elder, on the Essenes, 30.
- Property, individual or private, opposed by all communists, 1, 2 ; communities within the state have to acknowledge the right of, 3 ; how socialists would get rid of property, 36, *Comp. Schaeffle*.
- Proudhon, not strictly a communist, 10, 11 ; cited, to show this, *ibid.*

Ranke, cited as to the Anabaptists of Münster, 44-50.

Rapp, George, founder of the Community of Harmony, 61.

Religion under socialism, its prospects, 243-253.

Rhys-Davids, his Buddhism cited, 27, and used, 28, 29.

Rottmann, at Münster, helped on the Anabaptist movement, 45, 49.

Rousseau not strictly a communist, 97.

St. Simon, his life, 107; opinions, *ibid.*; views of his followers, 108, 109; schism among his followers, 111; L. Stein's estimate of, *ibid.*; had a number of noteworthy disciples, 112.

Schaeffle, his "Quintessence of Socialism" reviewed at length and briefly examined, 201-226; his definition, 14; general plan, 201-204; they think time is working with them, 205; question of right, 207; compensation to capitalists, 207, 208; great promises to workingmen, 209; costs, question of, in social production, 211, 212; value in use disregarded by them, 213; wide sweep of the social plan, 214-218; difficulties of socialism, 218-220; private income under socialistic organization, 220-222; religion, marriage, etc., 223-225.

Schweitzer, Alexander, head of Lassalle's Workingmen's Union (from 1867 to 1871), 182, 183; intrigues against him by Liebknecht and others, *ibid.*; failed of reelection, *ibid.*

Separatists. See Zoar.

Shakers, 50-60; founder of the, 53; opinions of, 54-57; discipline of, 58-60; resemblances to some ancient communities, 50; numbers, 51; declining, 52.

Socialism, definition of, 2; how it differs from communism, 7, 9; definition of, by a lecturer, 12; by Schaeffle, 14; the term used as synonymous for communism, 4; socialism, in the modern idea of it, makes the state the only capitalist; has never been realized, 22; Morelly's socialistic state, 99-101; the Equals and their plan, 104, 105;

- Fourier not strictly a socialist, 113; Cabet was such, 118-122; L. Blanc prepared the way for German socialism, 125; the International, socialistic. See International. Differences in the International in regard to private property, 144-146. Marx, the scientific organ of socialism, 161 (see Marx); how far Lassalle was a socialist, 179 (see Lassalle); strict socialism triumphing since his death, 183-190; its power in Germany, at the polls, by the press, 190, 191; professors in the universities giving it a partial support, 192; the social state necessarily despotic, 229-231; yet at first must be democratic in form, 232, 233; its relations to the land, 234, 235; its intercourse, 235; its finances, 236; its taxes, *ibid.*; weakness in war, 237; amount of patriotism in, 237; of hopefulness and enterprise in, 238, 239; circulation of knowledge in, 241; literature and public opinion in, 241, 242; relations of, to religion, 243-253; to marriage, 254-259; to some now existing evils, 260-263; to humanity, 263, 264; to education, 264-267. A social state necessarily despotic, 267-271; see Eötvös. The question of the overturn of existing society by socialism considered, 276-286; opposition to it to be expected from smaller proprietors, 288; from small landholders, 291.
- Sparta, had some communistic elements in its early institutions, 18; but these ceased before Aristotle's time, 98, 99.
- State, the socialistic, its probable form, etc. See Socialism.
- Stein, L., his social movements in France often cited, as, 111, 114.
- Sudre, A., his prize essay on communism and socialism cited, 101, 244; and elsewhere.
- Therapeutæ, the, 32, 33.
- Tolain, a founder of the International, expelled for accepting a place in the French Assembly (1870), 157; his opinions on expropriating land, 142.

Treitschke, von H., his "Socialismus u. s. Gönner" cited, 174; his estimate of the socialists in Germany, 190.

Utopia, meaning of the word, 90. Sir T. More's work so called, 89-92.

Workingmen's Union, founded by Lassalle, 176-178; its destinies after his death, 182, 183.

Workingmen's Party, the Social Democratic, founded at Eisenach (1869), 183; really a branch of the International, 184. See Eisenach; Gotha.

Zoar, or the Separatists, 62-64, 76-78.





unla
pes



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 057325885